

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION SERIES

Publication No. : 13,969

AUTHOR: Huber Winton Ellingsworth, Ph. D., 1955
The Florida State University

TITLE: SOUTHERN RECONCILIATION ORATORS
IN THE NORTH, 1868-1899

University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

SOUTHERN RECONCILIATION ORATORS IN THE NORTH, 1868-1899

By
HUBER WINTON ELLINGSWORTH

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate Council of
Florida State University in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

Wayne C. Minnick
Professor directing dissertation

Huber W. Ellingsworth

Thomas R. Lewis

Gregg Pife

Weymouth T. Jordan

M. W. Cascoche
Dean of the Graduate School

August, 1955

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem Review of Related Literature Evaluation and Justification of the Study Limitations Imposed on Study Materials and Method Organization of Materials	
II. THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE RECONCILIATION MOVEMENT	10
Reconciliation in Perspective The Scope of the Southern Rhetorical Effort Toward Reconciliation Stature and Reputation of the Reunion Orators Motives of the Reconciliation Speakers Geographical Distribution of Southern Reunion Speaking in the North The Occasions for Reconciliation Speaking Chronological Distribution of Speeches Extent of the Primary Audience Extent of the Larger Audiences Reached by Southern Reunion Speeches Summary	
III. A SURVEY OF RECURRENT ISSUES AND MODES OF PROOF IN SOUTHERN RECONCILIATION ORATORY	61
Recurrent Themes Prevailing Modes of Proof Summary	
IV. THE FOUR MOST PROMINENT RECONCILIATION ORATORS.	103
Introduction Wade Hampton Analysis of Hampton's Reconciliation Speeches Fitzhugh Lee Analysis of Lee's Reconciliation Speeches John Brown Gordon Analysis of Gordon's Reconciliation Speeches Henry Watterson Analysis of Watterson's Reconciliation Speeches Summary and Conclusions	

V. PROBABLE INFLUENCE OF SOUTHERN RECONCILIATION SPEAKERS IN THE NORTH	218
The End of War and the Beginning of Reconstruction Reconciliation as an Emotional Manifestation An Appraisal of Responses to Speeches Con- taining Recurring Issues A Description and Analysis of Immediate and Secondary Reactions to the Southern Orators Appraisal of Probable Response to Speeches in Which the Speakers Sought Specific Overt Action	
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	266
Summary Conclusions Implications	
APPENDIX.	279
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	282

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In his history of reconciliation, The Road to Reunion, Paul H. Buck describes in some detail the attempts made by the sections to restore peace and harmony following the Civil War. At one point he comments: "The South . . . began in this period [c. 1876-1880] the practice of sending some of her most persuasive orators into the North to play upon the emotions of the people."¹ Subsequently Don Streeter and William N. Brigance corroborated the existence of such a group of speakers. Streeter mentions in his study of Lucius Q. C. Lamar that Lamar was one of a group of Southern speakers who attempted to achieve reconciliation by speaking to Northern audiences.² Brigance, surveying outstanding American orators, makes practically the same reference to Lamar.³ Henry Grady, in delivering his famous "New South" speech, presented it to a Northern audience.

Such evidence suggested the existence of a well-defined body of speaking, the nature and extent of which had not been properly

¹(Chicago: Little, Brown and Co., 1937), p. 132.

²Don Streeter, "The Major Public Addresses of Lucius Q. C. Lamar During the Period 1847 to 1890" (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Speech, University of Iowa, 1949), p. 114.

³William N. Brigance, "The Twenty-eight Foremost American Orators," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIV (October, 1938), 19.

delineated. Hence, an investigation was begun to discover answers to the following questions: Who were the Southern speakers who spoke before Northern audiences on the theme of reconciliation between North and South during the period 1866-1900? Were there enough of these speakers to constitute a recognizable movement? Was the movement organized, or was it spontaneous? What were the attitudes of the Northern audiences who heard the Southerners deliver their speeches? What were the reactions of the Northern audiences to these speeches? What means of proof were used in these speeches? What comments are available concerning the delivery of the speeches? Are any changes observable in the manner in which the speakers treated their subjects as the movement progresses chronologically? Does the evidence indicate that the speeches played a significant role in reconciliation?

Evaluation and Justification of Study

There has not hitherto existed a study of the Southern reconciliation speakers as a group. Several scholars, however, have undertaken analyses of aspects of the speaking of several individuals included in this study. In addition to Streeter's dissertation on Lamar, cited above, there have been four theses at the master's level and one at the doctoral level, all concerned with the speaking of Henry W. Grady.¹ A survey of the annual graduate research report in

¹John Ackeley, "Elements of Persuasion in the Oratory of Henry W. Grady" (Unpublished M. A. thesis, Dept. of Speech, University of Southern California, 1933); Marvin G. Bauer, "Henry Grady, Spokesman of the New South" (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Speech, University of Wisconsin, 1936); Earl C. Bryson, "Henry W. Grady as an Occasional Orator" (Unpublished M. A. thesis, Dept. of Speech, University of Iowa, 1931); Dorothy S. Hadley, "Contemporary Estimate of Henry W. Grady as a Public Speaker" (Unpublished M. A. thesis, School of Speech

Speech Monographs and the Table of Contents of the Quarterly Journal of Speech and Speech Monographs¹ fails to reveal additional writing related to the proposed study.

The Research Committee of the Speech Association of America is at present investigating the role of public speaking in creating a spirit of disunion immediately preceding the Civil War. The fact that a period study on this topic was undertaken by such a distinguished group in the speech profession is significant because the study of disunion speaking provides an ante-bellum parallel for the consideration of reconciliation speaking in the post-war period.

There seems little doubt that oratory has played a part in virtually all social, political, and religious movements which have taken place in history. According to William C. Lang, a student of history:

The speaker . . . is a force in history. For the scholar remains the significant task of assessing the forces at work. A cumulative effect of many speeches by many men makes the task of qualitative and quantitative evaluation more difficult. Nevertheless, evaluation of greater validity combining philosophical criticism, rhetorical analysis, and historical analysis will grow from assiduous and thorough study of the place of public address as a force in history.²

It was with this thought in mind that the writer undertook an investigation of Southern reconciliatory speaking.

Northwestern University, 1937); Ethel Keeney, "Sources of Persuasive Power in Speeches of Henry W. Grady" (Unpublished M. A. thesis, School of Speech, Northwestern University, 1930). Bauer's study formed the basis of his article on Grady in William N. Brigance, A History and Criticism of American Public Address (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1943).

¹(Columbia, Missouri: Speech Association of America, 1951).

²W. C. Lang, "Public Address as a Force in History," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVII (February, 1952), 34.

Limitations Imposed on the Study

A number of limitations have been imposed on this study. Only Southern speakers whose homes were in the former Confederate states or who expressed their sympathies for the South through service in the Confederate armed forces or government were considered. Such a limitation excludes such men as Joseph Chamberlain, a New Englander who became Republican governor of South Carolina after the war and who did not represent a truly Southern point of view because of his championing of Negro suffrage.

Only speeches delivered to audiences of Northerners were considered. The strained relationships of North and South during the period following the war demanded an approach on the part of Southern orators in the North that was presumed to be different from that employed when they voiced reconciliatory themes on their home ground. Southern speakers addressed persons who had recently been their conquerors and who still looked with distrust on the motives and actions of the former rebels; consequently the speakers were obliged to fit their persuasion to the attitudes of their audience.

The study specifically excludes speaking to governmental assemblies and political conventions. Speeches delivered in Congress on reconciliatory themes comprise enough material for a separate study. Furthermore, the Congress of the United States, except between 1860 and 1872, is by definition a national, rather than a regional group. Presumably the Southerners addressing an assembly composed of representatives of the South, North, and West

approached the problem of reconciliation differently from those speaking only to Northern listeners.

Oratory at political conventions was also omitted because examination of data revealed that they were not attended by strictly Northern audiences and because the Southern speakers frequently used these rallies for partisan analyses of issues which probably contributed little to reconciliation.

The time limit fixed for the study was 1868-1899. The former date marks the first discovered speech conforming to the limitations set above, while the arrival of 1900 saw the close of that burst of reconciliatory speaking prompted by the Spanish-American War and provides a convenient terminal point for the study.

Reconciliatory speaking has been defined as any speech the principal theme of which was the promotion of sympathy and good will between North and South. This definition embraces such concepts as the profession of loyalty to the Federal Government and the denial of disloyal acts, admission that the Southern position on slavery was a mistake, praise of the character and integrity of Northern leaders and of the valor of the Union armies, declarations of fair treatment of the Southern freedmen, pleas for Northern colonization and investment, and other related ideas.

Materials and Method

The first step in building the study involved an extensive reading of secondary materials in American history dealing with the periods before, during, and following the Civil War in an attempt to gain a background concerning the forces of disunion and reunion.

Notations were made of all Southerners indicated as making efforts toward reconciliation and of all activities of an apparently reconciliatory nature. All available anthologies of public address were scanned for entries pertinent to the topic. From these sources a working list of names and speeches was compiled, to be amended as further information became available.

Complete microfilm series of the New York Times, 1865-1900, and of the St. Louis Post Dispatch, 1874-1900, were examined for any reference to reconciliation in general and particularly to speeches of the desired nature. Complete collections of the Nation, Forum, Harper's Weekly, Atlantic Monthly, and Frank Leslie's Illustrated Weekly Newspaper were similarly consulted. In addition to the long and continuous series of these publications, fifty-four other periodicals, including Century, Independent, Scribners, DeBow's Review, Southern Review, Lippincott's Magazine, and Land We Love, were examined. Some of these periodicals had runs of only one or two years; others embraced most of the period.

The working list of names was then checked with biographical sources to determine whether all met requirements for the study. The Library of Congress Catalogue of Printed Cards was consulted to discover sources pertinent to the persons involved, and these sources, including autobiographies and collections of letters and speeches, were scrutinized. Newspapers and other publications not available in the library of the Florida State University were obtained through the Interlibrary Loan Service, with central offices in the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. Titles not obtainable through this service

were examined at the Midwest Interlibrary Materials Center, Chicago. Research was also conducted at the Carnegie University library and the library of the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania, both located in Pittsburgh, and at the University of Florida library in Gainesville. Correspondence was carried on with the secretaries of those societies where Southerners were known to have spoken, as a means of gaining additional information about audiences and speakers.

The next step was to examine collections of newspapers from cities in and near where reunion speeches occurred. Such papers as the Boston Advertiser and Boston Pilot, Cleveland Leader and Plain Dealer, Chicago Tribune, Dayton Daily Journal, Duluth Minnesotan, Louisville Courier-Journal, New York Herald, Pittsburgh Commercial Gazette, Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, and Springfield Republican were consulted. During the process of research, complete texts of speeches, abstracts, and paraphrases were collected.

When all available data had been secured, analysis of the material was begun. Tables were compiled showing such information as home states of the speakers, their occupations and official positions, dates and titles of speeches, occasions of presentation of speeches, geographical distribution of speeches, and estimated numbers of auditors. Collected texts, excerpts, and paraphrases of speeches were outlined for ease in discovering their content. Tabulations of recurrent themes were then made. The speeches were analyzed to discover the prevailing modes of proof employed in the movement. Content of the speeches and the circumstances of their delivery were examined to determine the probably motives of the speakers in delivering their messages.

Material was analyzed and organized relative to the general attitude of the Northerners toward their Southern visitors, as well as toward the specific issues presented by the speakers. The same was done with data on the reaction to the speeches and on their probable influence in reconciliation. The materials thus made available provided an adequate basis for an account of Southern attempts to achieve peace and good will between the sections through delivery of speeches in the North.

It was decided that a more adequate picture of the reconciliatory movement under study might be revealed by a detailed analysis of the speaking of several of the most significant men in the movement, and data was therefore assembled about speech arrangement, modes of proof employed, style, and comments on delivery of four of the speakers. Those chosen for careful analysis were John B. Gordon, Fitzhugh Lee, Wade Hampton, and Henry Watterson. These individuals were selected from among their contemporaries on the basis of their continuing national prominence and popularity, the number of reconciliatory speeches which they delivered in the North, and the size of the audiences who heard them.

Organization of Materials

Following the collection and analysis of materials, a structure was sought which would provide an adequate basis for reporting the data. The following plan was adopted as the most satisfactory.

Chapter II aims to provide an overview of the major forces working toward the restoration of national feeling in America. It then describes the efforts of the Southern reconciliatory speakers

with regard to speakers and speeches, the geographical area covered by the speakers, home states of the speakers, probably motives in delivery of the speeches, occasions on which the speeches were given, and the immediate and larger audiences.

Chapter III lists the most frequently recurring issues in reconciliatory speaking and analyses argumentative techniques employed by the speakers.

In Chapter IV, an attempt has been made to provide a rather detailed survey of the arrangement, style, and modes of proof of the most prominent individuals in the movement, John B. Gordon, Wade Hampton, Fitzhugh Lee, and Henry Watterson, together with some contemporary comments on their delivery.

Chapter V provides a discussion of the probable influence of the speakers, individually and as a group, upon their audiences. The estimate is based upon the attitudes which they faced in the North, comments of contemporaries, analyses of situations in which a specific response was expected by the speakers and other evidence.

In Chapter VI, the previous chapters are summarized and conclusions concerning the study are drawn.

CHAPTER II

THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE RECONCILIATORY SPEAKING MOVEMENT

Reconciliation in Perspective

Reconciliatory oratory did not function apart from the combination of economic, social, and political forces active in promoting reunion between the sections. Rather it was an agency through which many of these forces found expression.

Perhaps the strongest organized effort aimed at promoting reunion was the Democratic party's attempt to throw off the stigma of being the party of rebellion.¹ From the ill-fated Philadelphia "arm-in-arm" convention of 1866 until Cleveland's second administration the Democrats were kept on the defensive regarding their moderate views on reconstruction. One of the chief weapons in their counter-attack on Radical reconstruction was the contention that the South was once again loyal to Federal authority and therefore entitled to political and social equality with the rest of the country. By way of strengthening this position, Northern Democrats from time to time called upon prominent ex-Rebels to appear in the North and offer personal reassurance of Southern loyalty. The Southern Democrats were also anxious, once military occupation had been ended and home

¹Buck, op. cit., p. 73.

rule restored, to forestall any Federal legislation which would lead to the supervision of polling-places by the central government. The return of the Democrats to national power, furthermore, was at least partially dependent upon an effective countering of "bloody shirt" politics in the North, which presumably discouraged numbers of otherwise undecided voters.¹

Faced with the realization that expanding industry was the key to power and prosperity in the post-war republic, certain Southern leaders began to call for Northern capital investment and industrial development of Southern resources. Accompanying the cry for industrialization was a clamor by Southern editors, planters, and real estate men for increased immigration from the North.² Southern reconciliation orators took their place in this movement by stressing the challenge which the exploitation of Southern resources offered to potential investors and by outlining in almost the same breath the boundless virtues of the South as a new frontier for homesteading. The speeches of Henry Grady and Henry Watterson in particular dealt with economic opportunities in the South.³

The degree of economic cooperation between the sections tended to be related to the socio-political situation of the moment. At times of open racial conflict or rumors of contemplated violence, Northern investors were especially apprehensive.⁴ This apprehension

¹Ibid., p. 74.

²Ibid., p. 151.

³These include Grady's speeches in New York and Boston and Watterson's address to the bankers at Louisville.

⁴Raymond B. Nixon, Henry W. Grady, Spokesman of the New South New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1943), pp. 237f.

in some cases was the signal for a Southerner to mount the platform and speak soothingly of loyalty and the desire for undisturbed peace. The reluctance of Northern capitalists to invest in the South was further increased by the untried Southern industrial force, and until 1880, investment tended to be limited to such items as railroad securities and state bond issues. Extensive railroad construction resulting from such issues, however, had by 1880 effectively tied the South into the national transportation system and further encouraged not only commerce but also the opportunities for easy migration to the South.¹

One of the most noteworthy of the social forces combining to promote reconciliation was the attitude of the Northern press after the end of the Congressional reconstruction period. The editorial policy of such publications as the New York Times, Nation, Harper's Weekly, and Chicago Tribune was a remarkable barometer of the state of North-South relations at any given time. During the first decade following the war, all four reflected strongly Republican views, and Harper's flaunted its Radicalism in publishing the waspish Thomas Nast cartoons. Following the 1876 campaign, and the election of Hayes in a disputed contest marked by little violence, Harper's did an abrupt about-face and began handling Southern news sympathetically. The Hayes victory had relieved the publication of the necessity of defending carpetbaggers and corruption. A less abrupt swing to a moderate viewpoint toward the South was observable in the editorials of Nation and the Times. After a lapse into anti-Southern ways before

¹Buck, op. cit., p. 155.

and during the 1880 campaign, the major Northern publications adopted a more settled moderate viewpoint except for occasional denunciations of the Southern treatment of the Negro or condemnations of enthusiastic displays for the symbols of the Confederacy.

Centennial celebrations of various events in the American Revolution and the establishment of the Republic occupied the attention of the nation during the period 1875-1878. These centennials were widely represented as opportunity for the old commonwealths to "clasp hands across the bloody chasm" by mutual heralding of events common to their heritage. Though the centennials were greeted in the South with some lethargy, they were the scene of numerous acts of good will, particularly between Civil War veterans, and provided the opportunity for a number of Southerners to express themselves on the platform.¹

Generally speaking, the war veterans were among the most enthusiastic purveyors of good will. As early as July, 1875, the Soldiers' National Reunion was held at Caldwell, Ohio, with invitations extended to Jefferson Davis, Alexander Stephens, and all Confederate soldiers and sailors. A number of Southerners did attend, but Davis and Stephens were not among them.² After this ambitious beginning there followed a whole series of formal reunions, usually involving one Confederate veteran group and one post of the Grand Army of the Republic, though joint meetings of a number of

¹Ibid., p. 134.

²Ellis M. Coulter, The South During Reconstruction, 1865-1877 (University, Louisiana: The Littlefield Fund for Southern History of the University of Texas, 1947), p. 387.

posts were not unknown. Reunions were usually on a "home-and-home" basis, with the posts alternating as hosts. This sort of activity was particularly heavy during the period 1881-86. Perhaps the largest celebration of the sort was held at the Chicago World's Fair during the summer of 1892.

One of the striking results of the friendships arising from these meetings was the cooperation of the Grand Army with the Confederates in raising funds for the erection of a home for disabled Southern soldiers at Richmond. Several thousands of dollars were raised by G. A. R. posts, including a fifty-dollar contribution by Ulysses S. Grant.¹ The Columbia G. A. R. post of Chicago was largely responsible for the collection of funds to erect a monument at Chicago for Rebels who died in prisoner-of-war camps there, partially as a result of the contacts made at the fair.²

While these reunions, formal and informal, provided the occasion for some reconciliatory speech-making, in general the activities seem to have been of an informal nature. For example, the funeral of one John Buck was conducted January 29, 1899, in Boston by the local G. A. R. post. Some former Confederates were present and walked to the cemetery "arm in arm with the veterans of the Blue under the old flag."³ A visit of the survivors of Pickett's Division was the high point of the program at the Gettysburg memorial

¹ George A. Kilmer, "A Note of Peace," Century Magazine, XXXVI (June, 1888), 440ff.

² Louisville Courier-Journal, September 13, 1896, p. 6.

³ Southern Historical Society Papers, XXVI (Richmond: William E. Jones, 1884), 308-10.

celebration July 3, 1887. The Southerners strolled over the scene of their charge with the soldiers who had opposed them.¹

A remarkable institution growing out of the war which ultimately led to the generation of a considerable amount of good feeling was Decoration Day, later Memorial Day. Its origins are obscure, but probably the practice of strewing flowers on the graves of dead husbands, sons, and brothers arose spontaneously from the hearts of Southern women in the unhappy days of 1864 and 1865. At any rate, Northern troops moving South at the close of the war observed the practice of large-scale grave decoration about them. Isolated Union graves were also garlanded by white Union sympathizers and by grateful Negroes. The following two years saw the custom being transferred to the North on a growing scale. In 1868 John A. Logan, commander of the G. A. R., issued an order designating May 30 the date for commemorating all those who had died in the defense of their country. Though this was hardly the context in which the observance had begun, the sections seemed drawn together by their common grief.² This unity never reached the point of celebrating Memorial Day on a common date, even in 1955.

The celebration became a mutual affair principally in border state cemeteries and at the scene of some major battles, both in the North and South. Some of the earlier observances of this sort were in the National Cemetery at Germantown, Pennsylvania, and at Nashville.³

¹New York Times, July 3, 1887, p. 4.

²Buck, op. cit., p. 116ff.

³New York Times, May 31, 1877, p. 4; Harper's Weekly, XXI (June 9, 1877), 438.

Fears were expressed from time to time that the day might become a symbol of bitterness and disunion, but the apprehensions were generally groundless. The South was disturbed at the guarding of the Arlington cemetery in 1868 to prevent the decoration of Rebel graves. Despite a few such unpleasant incidents, the main by-product of the observance of Decoration Day was a deep-seated mutual sympathy. The New York Times was able to pronounce in 1884:

The observance of the day is even more general than it was immediately after the war. Meanwhile the partisan or sectional aspects that the celebration then had have disappeared and what political significance the day retains is simply national.¹

As might be expected, Southern orators not infrequently appeared at these celebrations to pronounce eulogies on all the soldiers who died for their beliefs.

As can be observed from this brief survey, Southern reconciliatory speaking was either a vital agent in, or a by-product of, a number of the principal forces aimed toward reunion, and as such deserves consideration for the part which it presumably played in the attempt to heal the sectional breach.

The Scope of the Southern Rhetorical Effort Toward Reconciliation

There has been some tendency on the part of historians and rhetorical critics to consider Southern speaking on the theme of reconciliation as being limited to one or two memorable orations, such as Henry Grady's "New South," or Lucius Lamar's Congressional "Eulogy of Sumner." Wirt A. Cate, in his biography of Lamar, zealously places

¹May 30, p. 4.

Lamar's eulogy of Charles Sumner at the pinnacle of reconciliation oratory, stating:

It detracts nothing from [Henry] Grady's most famous speech, the New South, to observe that the influence of Lamar's ideas, particularly of his oration over the dead Sumner is to be seen in every line. And it is noteworthy that, except for certain of Lamar's other addresses, there was an interval of twelve years between these two great orations when no other such liberal voices were heard from the South, or for that matter, from the nation.¹

An almost identical expression, but with Grady as the hero, is the comment of Grady's biographer, Raymond B. Nixon:

Grady was not the first Southerner to plead for harmony and trust between the sections. Lamar had said: "My countrymen, know one another and you will love one another." Hill repeatedly had urged North and South to "Unite and repair the evils that distract and oppress the country." Watterson . . . had proclaimed "war or no war, we are all countrymen; fellow-citizens." But Hill and Lamar had spoken too soon, while Watterson was of much too contentious a nature, as well as too far apart from business interests on the tariff question, ever to be accepted as a "symbol of peace and good will."

Grady was the right man speaking the right word at the right time.²

J. W. Lee described the Grady speech as "twenty minutes in length, but it did more to unite the North and the South than all the orations of politicians and discussions of editors that had occupied public attention since the war."³ Still another Grady supporter proclaimed:

Mr. Grady's fame does not rest on his success as a journalist or his ability as a politician. His was the

¹Lucius Q. C. Lamar (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935), p. 59.

²Nixon, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

³Henry W. Grady, *the Editor, The Orator, The Man* (St. Louis: Christian Advocate Co., 1896), p. 81f.

mission of peacemaker and interpreter between the North and the South. Appreciating the virtues of both sides, he realized that sectional animosity was largely the result of ignorance and misunderstanding and these he set himself to remove. His first opportunity to do this at the North was when he was invited to the banquet of the New England Society. His speech, breathing harmony, fraternity, and good will, touched the keynote of the situation. He showed the people of both sections that we may love and honor the dead Confederacy with absolute loyalty and devotion to the restored Union.¹

The conclusion of these individuals is seconded by Marvin G. Bauer in his study of Grady.² Grady is here listed as foremost of a group of reunion orators which includes Lamar, Hill, Watterson, Horace Greeley, and Carl Shurz, the latter two not Southerners. While Grady and Lamar were doubtless notable reconciliation speakers, it seems prudent to evaluate them within the context of a more accurate appraisal of the scope of Southern reconciliatory speaking. As for Cate's statement, cited above, that "there was an interval of twelve years [March, 1874-December, 1886] . . . when no other liberal voices were heard from the South," it must be noted that during this interval no less than sixteen Southern men expressed reconciliation sentiments in the North. Cate does not choose to define "liberal," but he notes that Lamar--unlike Grady--"always retained a thorough-going skepticism concerning the desirability of an ultra-industrialized social order." If this is the case, Lamar shared his "liberalism" with Fitzhugh Lee, John B. Gordon, and particularly with Henry Watterson.

¹Edna H. L. Turpin (ed.), The New South and other Addresses (New York: Maynard, Merrill and Co., 1904), p. 17.

²Bauer, op. cit.

Bauer's suggestion that Southern reconciliatory speaking was confined to four men needs to be reevaluated in light of the discovery that at least twenty-three additional individuals spoke during the period 1866-1900 to Northern audiences on the theme of reconciliation.¹ Thus it may be seen that, contrary to existing accounts, the reconciliation movement was not confined to a few outstanding speeches, but was made up of a variety of speeches which functioned with the potent social, economic, and political forces at work in the country to reestablish good will between the sections.

Stature and Reputation of the Reunion Orators

With perhaps five exceptions, the speakers who engaged in reconciliation speaking during this period were men of stature in their sections. Five of the men were governors. Alfred Colquitt, a former Confederate Major-General, was Governor of Georgia from 1876 to 1882, moving to the United States Senate in 1883 to complete Benjamin Hill's unexpired term and remaining there until 1890. He likewise interested himself in moral causes as a temperance lecturer and president of the International Sunday School Union. Though never occupying a pulpit regularly, he was a licensed Methodist minister. Another Georgian who served as both governor and senator was John B. Gordon, who was elected for three non-consecutive Senate terms (1873-75, 1878-1880, 1890-92), and who was Georgia Governor from 1886.

¹These men included Garnett Andrews, M. B. Ball, Thomas F. Bayard, Simon B. Buckner, Alfred H. Colquitt, James Gilchrist, John B. Gordon, Wade Hampton, Hillary Herbert, Clark Howell, David Key, Fitzhugh Lee, William Gordon McCabe, Charles Marshall, Thomas Nelson Page, James G. Porter, Charles Portlock, Roger Pryor, Thomas Y. Simons, W. L. Trenholm, Alfred M. Waddell, Joseph Wheeler, Bennett Young. They must be included with Grady, Hill, Lamar, and Watterson in an accurate appraisal of the movement.

to 1890. He teamed with Lucius Lamar in helping to defeat carpet-bag rule in Mississippi and likewise aided Wade Hampton in the latter's gubernatorial campaign of 1876. A colorful military figure who led the last Confederate charge at Appomattox, Gordon was instrumental in organizing the United Confederate Veterans in 1890 and served as commander of the organization until 1904. Wade Hampton, after becoming the first post-war Democratic governor of South Carolina in 1876, served an extended term in the Senate (1879-91). Like Gordon, Hampton was a noted Confederate soldier, rising to the rank of Lieutenant General and commander of all Confederate cavalry. Also noted for both military and political prowess was Fitzhugh Lee. A former Brigadier General in the Army of Northern Virginia, Lee served as Governor of Virginia during 1886-90. He was appointed Consul-General to Havana in 1896 and in 1898 commissioned Major General in the United States Army. Following the fall of Santiago, Lee was placed in charge of restoring order in Cuba. The Army retired him as a Brigadier General in 1901. Before the outbreak of the Civil War, Simon Bolivar Buckner had graduated from West Point and taken part in the War with Mexico. As a Confederate soldier he rose to the rank of Lieutenant General. After Appomattox he settled in Louisville as editor of the Courier-Journal, selling it in 1868 to Henry Watterson. He was governor of Kentucky from 1887 to 1891 and in 1896 was Vice-Presidential candidate on the Sound-Money Democratic ticket.

A number of other reconciliation speakers were elected to the United States Congress. These included Senators Benjamin Hill (1876-

80), David Key (1875), and Lucius Lamar (1877-85), and Representatives Hillary Herbert (1877-93), Alfred Waddell (1870-78), Henry Watterson (1876-77), and Joseph Wheeler (1880-82; 1885-1900). Unlike most of his associates, Benjamin Hill did not enter the Confederate Army, but served as a Confederate Senator from Georgia throughout the war. He served the term 1875-76 in the House of Representatives, moving from there to the Senate. David Key, a Confederate Lieutenant Colonel, settled in Chattanooga following the war and set up a law practice. His entry into politics came in 1875 when he was appointed Senator to serve out Andrew Johnson's term. In 1877, President Rutherford B. Hayes appointed him Postmaster General, a position which he held until 1880, when he became a federal judge. His Senate speeches on the restoration of good feeling between the sections attracted the attention of Hayes and led to his cabinet appointment. Lucius Lamar was active in several capacities on behalf of the Confederacy. Commissioned a Lieutenant General, he retired in 1862 because of ill health and subsequently served as special ambassador to Russia and Judge-Advocate to the Army of Northern Virginia. After the war he taught history at the University of Mississippi and in 1872 was sent to Congress. His eulogy of Charles Sumner in 1874 gained him national acclaim as a peacemaker and aided his election to the Senate in 1877. Grover Cleveland appointed him Secretary of the Interior in 1885, a position which he held until 1888, when he became an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. Hillary Herbert was an Alabama lawyer who served as a Confederate Lieutenant-Colonel. He served in the Congress from 1877 to 1893, where he was active in committee affairs. In 1893, Grover

Cleveland appointed him Secretary of the Navy, in which capacity he worked for an enlarged and modernized Navy. Alfred M. Waddell, likewise a lawyer and Confederate Lieutenant-Colonel, was elected to Congress from Wilmington, North Carolina, in 1870. He was a member of the "Committee of Thirteen" to investigate Reconstruction. In 1878 he left the House to become editor of the Charlotte Journal. He was author of three history books, one on the Civil War in North Carolina. Waddell was a frequent orator at patriotic and political meetings and commencements. Henry Watterson spent his childhood in Washington, where his father was a Tennessee Congressman. During the Civil War, he mixed military activity with journalism, editing a daily Confederate newspaper, the Rebel, and fighting in the ranks during the last year of the war. After Appomattox, he became publisher of the Louisville Journal, which he merged in 1868 with the Courier. During 1876-77, he was a Representative from Kentucky. A prolific lecturer and writer, he published a Life of Abraham Lincoln. West Pointer Joseph Wheeler fought in Indian wars in Kansas and New Mexico before entering the Confederate forces in 1861. Retiring as a Lieutenant General, he practiced law in Alabama until his election as a Representative in 1880, a position which he held until 1896. Because of his military background, he was commissioned a Major-General in the U. S. Army in 1898 and placed in charge of American volunteers to fight the Spaniards. After taking an active part in the war in Cuba, he was reelected to Congress. His commissioning marked the first attempt by the Army to utilize the services of a former U. S. officer who had defected to the Confederacy.

W. L. Trenholm was the only reconciliation orator who entered

the Federal Government without previous Congressional experience. He was a Lieutenant Colonel in the Charleston Rifles during the Civil War. After the war he was a banker in Charleston until 1865, when he was appointed to the Civil Service Commission. His other opportunity in federal service came the following year, when he became Comptroller of the Currency.

Turning from the field of government to other areas of responsibility and influence, we find that many reconciliation orators were also journalists of some note. As mentioned above, Buckner, Waddell, and Waterson edited newspapers. Henry Grady had a varied career in journalism. As a young man, he worked as a correspondent for the New York Herald. His first attempt at editing, the Rome Daily Commercial, failed, as did his second effort, the Atlanta Herald. In 1879 Grady was introduced by John B. Gordon to Cyrus Field, who lent him \$20,000 to buy into the Atlanta Constitution. Grady edited this newspaper until his death in 1889. He was succeeded by Clark Howell, former night editor of the Constitution. For a time after the war, Roger Pryor served as staff member on the New York Daily News. Thomas Y. Simons edited the Charleston Courier during the period 1865-73.

Three individuals gained distinction in other fields. They are William Gordon McCabe, Thomas Nelson Page, and Bennett Young. McCabe was a Virginia historian and literary critic; Page wrote several popular novels, most of them lauding the romanticism of the Old South. Young, who became president of the Chicago, Indianapolis, and Louisville Railroad, was active in encouraging higher education in

Kentucky and served for brief periods as president of several Kentucky seminaries and colleges. Garnett Andrews settled in Mississippi after the war and established a successful law practice.

Five reconciliation speakers returned from military service in 1865 to lead such quiet lives that they were not included in any biographical collection examined by the writer. References to William B. Ball and E. E. Portlock were discovered only in connection with the return of a captured battle-flag to the 169th New York Regiment. James G. Porter and James Gilchrist were officers in the Washington Light Infantry of Columbia, which participated in the Centennial celebrations at Boston, but nothing else was determined concerning their non-military activities. Charles Marshall, wartime aide of Robert E. Lee, subsequently gained notice only once, by an address at Grant's tomb on May 30, 1892.

All but four of the group who delivered reunion addresses in the North were veterans of Confederate military service. Of those who did not serve, three could plead ineligibility. They were Henry Grady, born in 1850; Clark Howell, born in 1863; and Thomas Nelson Page, who was born in 1853. The other non-veteran was Benjamin H. Hill, who was active in Confederate governmental affairs throughout the war. Records of most of the military men were distinguished, if rank attained is a measure of distinction. Among those orators who saw service are such high-ranking officers as Brigadier-Generals Buckner and Lee, Major General Colquitt, and Lieutenant Generals Gordon, Hampton, and Wheeler. Also included are Colonels Andrews, Ball, Gilchrist, Herbert, Key, Lamar, Marshall, Portlock, and Waddell,

and Captains Simons and Trenholm. The sole Confederate veteran not to hold a commission was Henry Watterson, who mixed his military service with journalistic activity. The rank held by the former Confederate officers was invariably remembered when they appeared on Northern platforms and doubtless added to their prestige.

Home States of the Reconciliation Orators

Six former Confederate states and two border states were represented by one or more speakers. Virginia produced six--William B. Ball, Fitzhugh Lee, William Gordon McCabe, Thomas Nelson Page, E. E. Fortlock, and Roger Pryor. South Carolina was next with five, James Gilchrist, Wade Hampton, James G. Porter, Thomas Y. Simons, and W. L. Trenholm. Georgia was third in number of speakers, sending Alfred Colquitt, John B. Gordon, Henry Grady, Ben Hill, and Clark Howell. Three spokesmen from Kentucky were Simon B. Buckner, Henry Watterson, and Bennett Y. Young. Mississippi was represented by Garnett Andrews and Lucius Q. C. Lamar, while Alabama sent Joe Wheeler and Hillary Herbert. Tennessee fostered David Key.

Motives of the Reconciliation Speakers

The problem of assessing the motives of a speaker in making a public speech is rife with pitfalls and any statements concerning motive must be buttressed with substantiating external evidence. In the majority of discovered reconciliatory speeches, available data indicates that the motive of the speaker lay in fulfilling the demands of the occasion, i. e., the speaker strove to promote sectional unity by returning a battle flag, eulogizing the Union dead at a memorial service, and the like. Such speeches included the Centennial

addresses of Andrews, Wilchrist, Lee, Porter, Simons, and Key; the speeches of Ball, Buckner, Gordon, Hampton, Portlock, Watterson, Wheeler, and Young to veterans' organizations; Decoration Day orations by Marshall, Pryor, Watterson, and Wheeler; a variety of miscellaneous occasions such as public dinners and conventions. Many of the speakers were careful to declare their reason for coming. Gordon opened his Confederacy lecture by stating:

In deciding to deliver a series of lectures you will credit me, I trust, with being influenced in part, at least, by other and higher aims than mere personal considerations. If, from the standpoint of a Southern soldier, I could suggest certain beneficent results of our sectional war; or if, as the Comrade and Friend of Lee, I could add any new facts illustrative of the character of Grant; or lastly, if I could aid in lifting to a higher plane the popular estimate placed by victors and vanquished upon their countrymen of the opposing section and thus strengthen the sentiment of national fraternity as an essential part of national unity, I should in either event secure an abundant reward.¹

He likewise noted in his Cincinnati speech: "I am here tonight by invitation of a committee; but let me admonish you in advance that I am not here to mingle in local controversies, to discuss State candidates, but I am here to make an appeal for one short hour against the effort which has been made for many long years to build up a barrier between the fellow-citizens of a common country."² He told the Boston Commercial Club: "These Southern friends and myself have come to look at your great factories, your manufactures, your great industries and wonderful material developments"³

¹T. B. Reed, Modern Eloquence, III (Philadelphia: John D. Morris and Company, 1900), 471.

²Cincinnati Enquirer, October 29, 1887, p. 5.

³New York Times, April 30, 1878, p. 5.

At the Gettysburg Reunion, Gordon stated simply: "I came . . . to meet the soldiers of the Union Army."¹

Wade Hampton justified his presence at the Chicago monument dedication by proclaiming: "In the name of my comrades, dead and living, and in my own name, I give grateful thanks to the brave men of Chicago who have done honor to our dead here. . . ."² He assured his audience at the Winnebago Fair of the honor which the speaking invitation had constituted by stating: "I have traveled more than a thousand miles in order that my acknowledgement . . . might be made to you in person. . . ."³

Alfred Waddell approached his lecture on the Confederate soldier as follows: "In attempting to respond to the invitation with which you have so highly honored me, my aim will be to reflect in some degree the spirit which prompted it--the soldier-spirit of courage, magnanimity, and patriotism."⁴

Hillary Herbert began his tribute to Grant by announcing: "It is not of Gen. Grant as a commander of armies in the field that I propose to speak this evening, but rather of his patriotic love for his whole country. . . ."⁵

It may be seen from these examples that the speakers often

¹Ibid., July 3, 1888, p. 2.

²Ibid., May 31, 1895, p. 1.

³Chicago Tribune, September 14, 1877, p. 1.

⁴Alfred M. Waddell, The Confederate Soldier (Washington: Joseph L. Pearson, 1878), p. 1.

⁵New York Times, April 28, 1894, p. 5.

declared their purpose in speaking. For the majority of the speeches no internal or external evidence indicates that the purpose was more complex than stated. It should be noted, however, that in fourteen of the speeches, the speaker apparently possessed motives apart from the demands of the situation or his declared intention. The speeches of Henry Grady furnish a case in point. The "New South" has for sixty-seven years been lauded by speech anthologists, editorial writers, and authors of speech textbooks as a masterpiece of persuasive oratory in which Grady unselfishly strove to reunite the divided country at the right psychological moment. This idea is typified in Lee's statement about the speech, cited above. Unquestionably much of the picture is an accurate one, except that Grady was not moved purely by statesmanlike enthusiasm to offer his services to the New England Society, as Bauer seems to imply in his simple statement that the speech was "given in response to an invitation from the New England Society."¹

Why, then, did Grady go to New York to address the New Englanders? The answer lies in the uneasy national political situation during the 1880's. The election of Grover Cleveland, together with a large slate of Democratic Congressmen, had produced considerable chagrin among Republican leaders. Such men as James G. Blaine and John Sherman were convinced that in order to regain control in the Congress, it would be necessary to carry some Southern states. This could be done only with a strong Negro Republican vote. Therefore Senator Sherman, Henry Cabot Lodge, and others began agitation for legislation which

¹William N. Brigance (ed.), A History and Criticism of American Public Address (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1943), II, 389.

would provide federal supervision of polling places to encourage a maximum colored Republican electorate in the South. This proposal was branded a force bill by Southerners and made critical the possibility of election riots such as had occurred during the military occupation of the ex-Confederate states prior to 1877.¹

The threat of returning violence in the South tended to make many Northern investors hesitant about pushing the economic development which they had begun, and which had resulted in an estimated forty per cent increase in Southern wealth between 1882 and 1886.² To Henry Grady, perhaps the most enthusiastic disciple of Southern renaissance through Northern investment, the situation was perilous. As one contemporary put it, "He did not tamely promote enterprise and encourage industry. He vehemently fomented enterprise and provoked industry until they stalked through the land like armed Conquerors."³ This attitude was expressed in his enthusiastic editorials. Grady, however, was not the most alarmed individual concerning the potentially disruptive election bill. John H. Inman of New York was responsible for a capital investment of at least \$100,000,000 in the South, principally in iron, coal, and railroads. Those investors whose funds were involved were becoming increasingly desirous of reassurances as to the safety of their money. Happily, two of Inman's associates in the investment enterprise, George F. Baker and H. C. Fahnestock, were

¹Davis R. Dewey, National Problems, 1885-1897. Vol. XXIV of The American Nation: A History. Edited by A. B. Hart. 28 vols. (New York: Harper Bros., 1904-1918), 164f.

²Nixon, op. cit., p. 237f.

³John D. Hicks, The American Nation (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1945), p. 222.

members of the New England Society. They succeeded in convincing the officers of the organization that a message expressing the motives and intentions of the Southern people would not be amiss, particularly if delivered by a Southerner who so enthusiastically encouraged Northern investment as Grady.¹

Grady skillfully set about to reassure the uneasy investors by indirection. The speech contains no mention of politics, Negro suffrage, threats of resistance, riots, or any other subject which might jeopardize Grady's masterful picture of the penitent, progressive South.

Between Grady's 1886 speech and his address to the Boston Merchants in 1889, the threat of a force bill continued to hang over the South. Consequently the desire to forestall such legislation provided the impetus for a second speech. Grady had met a Patrick Collins at the National Democratic Convention of 1888, and in October, 1889, introduced him as a speaker at the Atlanta Piedmont Exposition. Collins brought word that Henry Cabot Lodge planned to introduce legislation demanding federal supervision of all polling places in national elections and asked Grady whether he would be willing to undertake a discussion of sectional issues before the Boston Merchants Association on December 13, 1889, with a view to placating the force bill sentiment. William Henry Harrison, in a message to Congress on December 3, 1889, had urged the adoption of such a bill.²

¹Nixon, op. cit., p. 238.

²Ibid., p. 316.

While the speech to the Boston Merchants more nearly reveals Grady's motives than his "New South" speech, he once again avoided direct mention of the proposed federal legislation. Instead, he chose to deplore the fact that the race problem, as he put it, was dividing the country, when all Americans had put up a solid front against the Indians and Orientals when they blocked progress. He assured his listeners that the colored men were making as rapid progress under their Southern white friends as their limited background and means would allow. This latter constituted his only reference, even indirectly, to the matter of the Negro ballot.

One of the most critical voices raised against the speech was that of the Boston Pilot:

In the golden list of great American orations, the speech delivered last week in Boston by Mr. Henry Grady, of Georgia, on the question of colored Americans, must take a high place. For the splendor of patriotism which graced its flow, it deserves high praise and a permanent place in the literature of oratory. But not as an American classic may it stand. It was pleasant to the ear, but unsatisfactory to the judgment and hopeless to the heart.

Mr. Grady, voicing the Southern whites, offers love and union to the North, but the condition, however wreathed with lovely flowers of speech, is the suppression of the legitimate rights of the Southern blacks.

Never did oratory cover up the weak points of repulsive cause more splendidly. When all is said about it, the burden of Mr. Grady's eloquence means the re-enslavement socially, if not legally, and forever, of the millions of black Americans in the South.¹

Other newspaper comments indicate a mixed note of praise and censure, but some called attention to the failure of Grady to face the issue squarely.

Another occasion in which the ostensible motivation of the

¹Sept. 15, 1877, p. 4.

speech may have been secondary to the actual one was the speech by Wade Hampton at Auburn, New York. Hampton declared that his purpose was to deliver to General James Shields a battle-flag carried by the South Carolina Regiment which he commanded in the Mexican War. After devoting a few minutes at the beginning of his address to this purpose, he turned to a discussion of political and social conditions in South Carolina. One editorial writer ungraciously called attention to this:

He made a speech, celebrating the glory of Gen. Shields in a neat autobiography of Wade Hampton's trials and triumphs in South Carolina. With that intimate acquaintance with the Creator which distinguishes a true son of the sunny South, he called God to witness that he should do various and sundry things in South Carolina; and he referred to his genial climate and fertile soil in terms that were well calculated to draw tears from a brass knocker.¹

Hampton's second reconciliatory effort, at the Winnebago County Fair, might also have been said to violate the spirit of the occasion, but discovered data indicates that he was not criticized as at Auburn:

Though it was an address before the County Agricultural Society, on the occasion of an agricultural fair, the public appearance of Wade Hampton of South Carolina before any assemblage of Illinois people merely to talk about agricultural matters would have been a disappointment. Something else was expected of him, and he knew it. Many others, nearer home, could have talked entertainingly, and perhaps instructively, about farm topics, but there was none other in a position to speak with more authority or more fairly to represent the Southern people, in discussing the relations between the North and the South.²

Benjamin H. Hill, the author of the first discovered reunion speech, also found a motivation, as had Grady, in immediate political circumstances. Hill, virtually alone among the Southern Democratic leaders in the early days of reconstruction, felt that the South could

¹New York Times, June 22, 1877, p. 4.

²Chicago Tribune, September 15, 1877, p. 4.

regain political ascendancy by avoiding conservative politics and accepting the inevitability of reconstruction and the fourteenth amendment. This policy was termed the "New Departure."¹

Two events during the summer and autumn of 1868 militated against Hill's proposals. The first concerned the convocation of the Georgia Legislature on July 4, 1868. Thirty-two Negroes presented themselves as duly elected representatives. Only July 25 a conservative resolution was introduced, calling for their expulsion on the grounds of improper election. During the first week of September, the expulsion was voted and accomplished. This act was widely proclaimed by the Radicals as a flagrant miscarriage of law. Republican Governor Bullock charged that a "reign of terror exists."²

The second occurrence which placed Georgia in a highly unfavorable light in the North was a riot in Camilla on September 19, two weeks after the expulsion resolution had been carried out. According to reports of the event released October 9 to Secretary of War James W. Schofield, a group of Negro Republicans had been on their way to attend a Republican rally in Camilla. A white man named James Jones had ordered a Negro band seated on a wagon to cease playing and when they did not, Jones fired his gun into the group on the wagon. This act was followed by general firing of guns. An Army officer on the scene, a Captain Mills, estimated that about half the Negroes and an undetermined number of whites were armed. The Negroes took cover in the woods outside of town and sporadic firing continued through the

¹Coulter, op. cit., p. 345.

²Haywood J. Pearce, Benjamin H. Hill, Secession and Reconstruction (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1928), p. 189.

day. Mills estimated that nine Negroes had been killed, about twenty-five to thirty wounded, and several whites injured.¹

The Negroes had apparently been organized by two carpetbag Radicals. The Republican group was opposed by most of the town's white citizens. Governor Bullock placed all the blame for the occurrence on the white conservatives.² The story was prominently displayed in the New York Times and Herald, and in the Chicago Tribune.

In the Columbus (Georgia) Sun, September 5, 1868, before the Camilla riots but after the legislative expulsion, appeared the following "personal" item: "Ben Hill is going on a stumping tour in the north western states at his own expense." This was the first inkling, according to Haywood Pearce, Hill's biographer, of a plan which Hill had of spending September and October in the North. His desire was to aid the Democrats and show the South in a more favorable light.³ Actually he made only one speech on the trip, the address before the Young Men's Democratic Union.⁴ The address was the most candid and thoroughgoing analysis of the issues in North-South relations delivered by any Southerner in the North, but it discussed them abstractly, avoiding such matters as Negro expulsion from the legislature or the Camilla riot.

That Hill received the impetus for his address to the Society of New York Editors from pending federal legislation is suggested by

¹New York Times, October 10, 1868, p. 2.

²Pearce, op. cit., p. 190.

³Ibid., p. 191.

⁴Ibid.

his biographer, Pearce. "In the summer of 1874," Pearce comments, "the South became greatly agitated over the new Civil Rights Bill, which had been passed by the Senate as 'a sort of memorial' to the recently-deceased Charles Sumner." A Northern newspaper correspondent reported Hill as saying that the South looked to Grant for relief from the bill, which would "disorganize southern society," and that the South would support Grant for a third term if he should veto the bill.¹

A mission somewhat similar to Hill's first trip to New York impelled John B. Gordon to venture into Ohio on the eve of general elections in 1887 to deliver speeches at Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland. One of the most consistent flourishers of the "bloody shirt" in the Buckeye state was J. B. Foraker, incumbent Republican governor, who in 1887 was being opposed by Thomas Powell. Never popular in the South because of his frequent anti-Southern proclamations, Foraker was particularly odious to Southern Democrats by virtue of his diatribe on President Grover Cleveland following the chief executive's order earlier in 1887 for the return from storage in the War Department of all flags formerly belonging to Confederate military units and their restoration to the states.² Thus the defeat of Foraker became one of the prime objectives of the national Democratic party, and of the Ohio Democrats in particular. Accordingly the Ohio State Democratic Central Committee directed an invitation to John B. Gordon, prominent leader of a deep-South state, to offer a rebuttal to the Ohio governor's allegations of Southern tyranny and

¹New York Times, June 7, 1874, p. 10.

²Buck, op. cit., p. 132.

disloyalty. County Democratic Committees planned rallies at Cincinnati, Dayton, Columbus, and Cleveland, at which Gordon was to speak.

It can be inferred from the speeches themselves that his strategy in the campaign was not openly to debate Foraker on the issue of Negro suffrage, on which the South was all too vulnerable, or to accuse the Ohioan directly of encouraging sectional strife, but rather to create a general atmosphere of good feeling toward the South while denouncing the Republicans as plunderers and political miscreants. Evidence of this is found in the Cincinnati speech:

I am not here to plead for candidates, but I am here to invoke the spirit that actuated that great Captain, Ulysses S. Grant, in the last hours of his life.

.
Oh, my friends, what are you going to do next November? Whether you vote for one man or the other--I don't intend to mention any names here--let me beg of you . . . rise in your might and, by the inexorable fist of a mighty public opinion, frown down forever the spirit which I have been discussing tonight.¹

The impetus for the Democratic cause created by Gordon's speeches in Ohio was not to be wasted, despite his reticence to mention names. Newspaper accounts in the Cincinnati Enquirer and the Dayton Journal indicate that Gordon was followed on the platform at Cincinnati and Columbus by a popular Democratic leader and Union veteran, Gen. George W. Morgan of Knox County, Ohio, who then proceeded to make the direct application of Gordon's innuendoes to Foraker and the situation in Ohio. Gordon was thus able to keep the avowed theme of his address on higher levels than had he chosen to come directly to grips with Foraker.

¹Cincinnati Enquirer, October 28, 1887, p. 8.

Another motivation in Gordon's reunion addresses combined his desire to reconcile the sections with the opportunity for monetary gain through paid lectures on "The Last Days of the Confederacy," generally under the sponsorship of a local G. A. R. post or state militia unit. The December 21, 1895, presentation was organized, for example, by the First Illinois Infantry Division,¹ while on February 15 his appearance was sponsored by the Columbia post of the G. A. R., Chicago.²

Henry Watterson's lectures on Lincoln and on "The Comicalities and Whimsicalities of Southern Life" were given under similar circumstances, though less frequently under the sponsorship of veterans' organizations, possibly because of his insignificance as a military figure. Advertisements in the Chicago Tribune on the day preceding his Lincoln address at Chicago February 12, 1895, indicate that sponsorship came from the Chicago Lincoln Council. His Dayton delivery of the "Comicalities and Whimsicalities" speech was apparently an independent undertaking, because advertisements on preceding days make no mention of local sponsorship.

Remarkably similar in approach to Gordon's canvassing in Ohio was the speech of Lucius Lamar at Nashua, New Hampshire. Lamar went to New England at the urgent request of the Democratic State Executive Committee to campaign in the interest of the Democratic candidates prior to the March 14 election, 1875.³ The Nashua speech, given March 6 under the auspices of the local Democratic committee, contained no reference to local candidates or issues. The Boston Daily Advertiser

¹St. Louis Post Dispatch, December 22, 1895, p. 15.

²Chicago Tribune, February 16, 1895, p. 4.

³Cate, op. cit., p. 194.

made the following observation:

His address was exactly suited to the mixed character of his audience. It was remarkably non-partisan, consisting merely of a statement of facts braced by the reports of Congressional investigations and a logical tracing of the causes which have led to whatever turbulence and disquietude exists; containing scarcely an allusion to either of the two political parties, and none whatever to the approaching election.¹

This speech constitutes another attempt by a Southern orator to accomplish a shift of opinion concerning local political issues by dealing in generalities.

In summary concerning the motivation of the Southern reconciliation orators, there is frequently little evidence to indicate that speeches were made for any motive extrinsic to the speaking situation other than a general desire to see good feeling restored, but that in a minority of speeches there was a definite political or economic motive to be served which is not evident from an examination of the speech texts themselves.

Geographical Distribution of Southern Reconciliation Speaking in The North

Nine Northern states played host to Southern reunion orators. A count of reunion speeches in these states reveals the following: twenty-nine speeches were heard in New York: thirteen occurred in Massachusetts; seven each took place in Illinois and Pennsylvania; four were heard in Kentucky and four in Ohio, and one each in Vermont, New Hampshire, and Tennessee.

Analysis by city reveals the following distribution of speeches: Allegheny, Pennsylvania--one; Auburn, New York--one; Bennington,

¹March 7, 1875, p. 1.

Vermont--one; Boston--thirteen; Brooklyn--five; Chicago--six;
 Cincinnati--one; Cleveland--one; Columbus--one; Dayton--one;
 Gettysburg--one; Louisville--four; Nashua, New Hampshire--one;
 Nashville--one; Manhattan, New York--sixteen; Philadelphia--three;
 Pittsburgh--one; Rockford, Illinois--one.

The Occasions for Reconciliation Speaking

The occasions on which reunion oratory occurred can be divided into eight general categories: centennials, Decoration Day celebrations, commercial and financial organization meetings, fairs, political rallies, veterans' organizations, public lectures, and other miscellaneous occasions.¹

Centennials

The celebration of centennials at Lexington, Concord, and Boston during June, 1875, attracted a number of Southerners who participated in the festivities and made reunion addresses, sometimes individually and sometimes in company with other Southerners. An invitation was extended by Boston City officials to the Southerners in Columbus Square upon their arrival June 16, 1875, and was responded to by Colonel Thomas Y. Simons of the Washington Light Infantry of Columbia, South Carolina.² Later in the same day at the Boston Music Hall Fitzhugh Lee, together with Garnett Andrews, gave brief speeches. The scene was a reception in honor of the Southerners, described as follows:

¹Because Chapter IV of this study deals in detail with the occasions on which Gordon, Hampton, Lee, and Watterson spoke, references in this chapter are limited to a mention of the occasion.

²New York Times, June 17, 1875, p. 1.

All the speeches were brief, impromptu and befitting a hearty social gathering, and all overflowed with the new found fraternal sentiment between North and South.

The announcement of Col. Andrews' presence called out instantly a spontaneous burst of applause, which showed unmistakably that the audience was determined to see the gentleman and hear him speak. He accordingly stepped forward. At his presence, and a call for three cheers, every man leaped to his feet and responded amid wild enthusiasm.

The speech of Col. Andrews, which was electrical in its effect as it was most magnificently eloquent, and for an offhand effort, best expressed the touch and go sensibility into which the assemblage was wrought.¹

Another reporter described Andrews' speech as "short, fervid, and patriotic."² On the following day, June 17, the Washington Light Infantry troop was entertained at the Governor's reception in the Doric Room of the Massachusetts statehouse and speeches were made by James Gilchrist and James G. Porter, representing the troupe.³

Later in the same summer David Key accompanied the party of President Hayes to the celebration of the Centennial of the Battle of Bennington, Vermont. He was a speaker at the banquet honoring the visiting dignitaries.⁴

Fitzhugh Lee participated in still another centennial, a celebration of the ratification of the Constitution in Philadelphia. He spoke at the Hibernian Society of Philadelphia at a banquet September 17, 1887.⁵

¹Boston Evening Transcript, June 18, 1875, p. 1f.

²New York Times, June 17, 1875, p. 2.

³Boston Daily Advertiser, June 18, 1875, p. 4.

⁴New York Herald, August 17, 1877, p. 3.

⁵Ibid., August 18, 1877, p. 4.

Commercial and Financial Organizations

Both the Boston Merchants Association and the Boston Commercial Club were host to reunion speakers. Henry Grady appeared December 13, 1889, before the former organization to discuss the race problem. The scene was a reception and banquet at the Hotel Vendome. About 400 persons were packed into the dining hall and several hundred others sought admission to the flower-decked room. The first speaker on the program was Grover Cleveland, who deplored election frauds. Grady was then introduced amid cheering and applause. During an hour of speaking Grady was interrupted twenty-one times by "shouts, cheers, and applause."¹ The same organization heard Watterson on October 3, 1890. John B. Gordon presented his views on Southern commercial opportunities before the Commercial Club April 27, 1878, while Watterson addressed the American Bankers' Association at their convention in Louisville October 11, 1883.

Fairs

Two Illinois fairs provided the setting for reunion utterances. They were the Winnebago County Fair, Rockford, Illinois, which heard Wade Hampton on September 13, 1877, and the Chicago World's Fair, at which Watterson gave the dedicatory address, including some reconciliatory sentiments.

Political Organizations

As might be expected, political organizations played host to a number of Southerners giving reunion speeches. The first instance

¹Boston Evening Transcript, December 14, 1889, p. 1.

of a reconciliation speech delivered by a Southerner in the North was that of Benjamin Hill before the Young Men's Democratic Union of New York. The exact setting and location of the speech are unclear, and examination of the New York Times and Herald-Tribune fail to make the matter any more definite. In writing a biography of his father, Benjamin H. Hill, Jr., complains that his father never preserved any data relating to his speeches, and is also unable to fix the location of the speech.¹ In introducing the speech in his oratorical collection, Chauncey DePew sets the date as October 8, 1868,² while Haywood Pearce notes it as October 6. Hill concurs with Pearce on this date. On the basis of limited evidence available, including an account of the senior Hill's visit to New York in the Times, this writer believes that the speech took place in Union Square on the evening of October 5. The Young Men's Democratic Club had set up a stand as part of a giant rally to endorse the Democratic ticket. Hill's name is not mentioned, the Times dismissing the matter with the comment, "the speechmaking was kept up until the people no longer listened."³ But while Hill was not reported as being present here, neither is reference made to his speaking at any of the meetings held during the three-day Democratic rally. Furthermore, the organization which he allegedly addressed is not described as sponsoring any other activities except the stand in Union Square.

Some of the same Democrats who heard Hill in New York probably

¹Senator Benjamin H. Hill; His Life, Speeches and Writings (Atlanta: T. H. P. Bloodworth, 1893), p. iv.

²Library of Oratory (New York: Dumont, 1902), X, 276.

³October 6, 1868.

also listened to Fitzhugh Lee delivering the principal oration at the Tammany Society's annual celebration of the Fourth of July , 1887. Lucius Q. C. Lamar was sponsored by the local Democratic committee of Nashua, New Hampshire, on March 6, 1875, at a local rally attended by members of both parties.¹

The Ohio State Central Committee of the Democratic party sponsored a tour by John B. Gordon in Ohio just before election day in 1887. Gordon made stops at Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland on October 28, October 29, and November 1, respectively. Three years before he had been the principal speaker at an organization with the imposing title of Merchants' and Business Men's Cleveland and Hendricks Club before its meeting at Delmonico's in New York. According to one description, "There was an atmosphere of satisfaction in the large dining room of Delmonico's last evening, when something like 200 gentlemen representing the down-town Cleveland and Hendricks Clubs which played so prominent a part in the recent campaign sat down to a sumptuous dinner, resolved to eat, drink and be merry."²

Veterans' Organizations

Among the most consistent hosts to Southerners with reconciliation messages were Union veterans. Three orators spoke, for instance, in connection with ceremonies involving the return of battle flags to individuals and groups. Wade Hampton, the first of these three, went to Auburn, New York, on June 20, 1877. Here he presented to General James Shields the flag carried by the South Carolina Regiment Shields

¹Boston Daily Advertiser, March 7, 1875, p. 1.

²New York Times, December 13, 1884, p. 2.

commanded in the Mexican War. A captured Civil War battle flag was restored with appropriate ceremonies to the One Hundred Sixty-Ninth Regiment of the New York National Guard on July 4, 1883. E. E. Portlock and William B. Ball, representing the Virginia Regiment which had captured the flag, made appropriate speeches in the presence of officers of the New York Regiment and cadets from Virginia Military Institute, who marched in the Fourth of July parade.¹

Veterans' conventions provided several occasions for speech-making. Henry Watterson twice addressed elements of the G. A. R. national convention in Pittsburgh on September 11, 1894, inviting them to hold their 1895 convention in Louisville. His invitation was accepted, and Watterson gave the address of welcome exactly one year later in the Falls City. Others speaking to the Union Veterans encamped at the Louisville Convention were Simon B. Buckner and Bennett Young. The setting of Buckner's speech is described as follows:

Phoenix Hall was never more gorgeous in the glitter from thousands of lights, intermingled with lavish festooning of buntings, than last night, when the grand camp fire was held under the auspices of the General Halls and Campfire Committee of the Encampment. By 8 o'clock the auditorium was literally packed and jammed, aggregating an audience of 3000 persons. Outside in the garden a great crowd was also gathered.

General Simon Bolivar Buckner addressed the people as "comrades of the North and South." His speech, while not extended, dwelt feelingly upon the conversion of sectional sentiment into a strong devotion to a common country. He said he was glad to welcome the G. A. R. veterans to Kentucky's fair soil. He believed, he said, that had the war been left to the soldiers engaged in it, it would not have been so prolonged, but that it was kept up by the influence of men who were not soldiers. He was cheered to the echo. Few speeches have been more significant in the decay and obsolescence of any strife or feeling of enmity between the North and South than Gen. Buckner's.²

¹New York Herald, July 5, 1883, p. 8.

²Louisville Courier-Journal, September 12, 1895, p. 1.

Bennett Young addressed a smaller segment of the Grand Army under more intimate conditions the following day:

One of the most pleasant incidents of the encampment was the informal call made by a number of prominent ex-Confederates of the city on the Columbia Post at its headquarters at the Gait House yesterday. The Columbia Post is one of the finest and wealthiest in the country, and attracted much attention by its magnificent appearance in the parade. . . .

It was not generally known, and consequently many Southern soldiers were denied the pleasure of receiving the cordial welcome which waited them though the Columbia Post will heartily receive to-day all ex-Confederate veterans. They desire to have as large a number of Southern Soldiers' names as possible on their register. An address of welcome was made by Capt. Puriton. Col. Bennett H. Young responded.¹

Two monument dedications supplied the occasions for reconciliation oratory by Southerners. Gordon spoke on behalf of the Southerners in dedicating a peace monument at Gettysburg July 3, 1888, while Wade Hampton dedicated a memorial to the Confederates who died in Chicago prison camps on May 30, 1895. Miscellaneous addresses to veterans' groups included Watterson's speech at the Dayton Soldiers' Home July 4, 1878, and his address to the Society of the Army of the Tennessee October 9, 1891, at Chicago. Joseph Wheeler gave a speech at a G. A. R. public dinner in his honor following his return from military successes in Cuba. He was also presented with a jeweled sword in honor of his services to the country by the combined Grand Army posts of Boston.²

Decoration Day Orations

On at least five occasions Southerners helped to commemorate the dead who had formerly been their enemies. Charles Marshall, former

¹Louisville Courier-Journal, September 12, 1895, p. 1.

²John P. Dyer, "Fightin' Joe" Wheeler (University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University, 1940), p. 385f.

chief aide to General Robert E. Lee, accepted the invitation to address at Decoration Day throng at the tomb of Ulysses S. Grant in upper Manhattan. Present were a "large crowd of spectators," including several New York G. A. R. posts and a band. "Col. Marshall was roundly cheered when he rose to speak. He had hardly started to talk, however, when the rain . . . came down in such a torrent as to end the ceremonies of the afternoon."¹

Roger Pryor, Virginia journalist and lawyer, accepted an invitation to deliver a Decoration Day oration at a celebration sponsored by the combined Brooklyn posts of the G. A. R. in 1877.² Henry Watterson was orator at two Union memorial services, the first at the Nashville cemetery in 1877, and the second at Cave Hill cemetery, Louisville, in 1899. Joseph Wheeler delivered a Decoration Day speech at the Boston Theatre in 1899. One reporter described the event as follows:

Gen. Joseph Wheeler, the cavalry leader, who led the boys in gray at the famous charge at Shiloh and nearly thirty-seven years later beneath the stars and stripes, cheered on the volunteers at Santiago, was the guest of honor at the memorial day services at E. E. Kinsley Post 113, G. A. R. at Boston Theatre. The immense Auditorium was filled to its utmost capacity. The singing of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" and the presentation of its author Mr. [sic] Julia Ward Howe, called forth a tremendous burst of applause.

.
When Gen. Wheeler arose to speak, the applause was tumultuous, cheer upon cheer arose from thousands and it was nearly fifteen minutes before the General could make himself heard.³

¹Louisville Courier-Journal, September 12, 1895, p. 1.

²New York Times, June 7, 1877, p. 5.

³Louisville Courier-Journal, May 3, 1899, p. 6.

Public Lectures

Two popular public lectures---"The Last Days of the Confederacy," by John B. Gordon, and "On Lincoln," by Henry Watterson---were heard a number of times during the period, both in the South and the North. The former was delivered at least four times in Chicago during 1893, 1895, and 1898. Watterson's address had its initial airing February 12, 1895, at Chicago and was heard again May 14, 1895, at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. His lecture, "The Comicalities and Whimsicalities of Southern Life," contained reconciliation sentiments on one occasion, but not in its other deliveries.

The details of a lecture given by Alfred M. Waddell at New York, May 3, 1875, are best described by the following account:

The lecture on "The Confederate Soldier," delivered at Steinway Hall last evening by Hon. Alfred M. Waddell, of North Carolina for the benefit of the Veteran Corps of the Forty-Seventh New-York Volunteers brought out a very full house, and was frequently interrupted by applause. Seated upon the platform were Joseph W. Parker, President of the organization, who introduced the lecturer; Mayor Ely, Postmaster James, John T. Hoffman, Hon. Stewart L. Woodford, Thurlow Weed, and Thomas J. Creamer.

.....
 Applause followed him from the platform. After the lecture, Mr. Waddell was the recipient of a serenade at the Union-Square Hotel by the military band stationed at Governor's Island.¹

The lecture itself appeared in published form later in the year, together with a detailed description of its presentation.

Miscellaneous Occasions

Grady's appearance before the New England Society in the City of New York is the best known setting for reunion oratory; this

¹New York Times, May 4, 1878, p. 3.

organization was also host to four other such speeches. Grady's effort took place in the banquet hall of Delmonico's restaurant. There were three hundred and sixty places, sold out in advance. The junior members of the society ate in other rooms, then lined up along the walls and in the doorways to hear the speaking. The speaker's table extended across one end of the room; six other tables were placed perpendicular to it. Grady's was one of a number of speeches, immediately following that of General William T. Sherman. Meanwhile in Philadelphia on the same evening, W. L. Trenholm was addressing that chapter of the New England Society. Said Harper's Weekly of the twin appearance:

The New South . . . has found a striking and significant expression in the appearance of Mr. Trenholm of South Carolina, The Comptroller of the Currency, and Mr. Grady, of Georgia, the editor of the Atlanta Constitution, as guests at the annual dinner of the New England Society, in Philadelphia and New York respectively. The strain of remark in these noted dinners is always patriotic, and the speeches naturally teem with glowing and tender allusions to the Civil War and the Union soldiers. It was a significant sign, therefore, of the actual situation that two of the strongest Confederates should rise in the midst of such a Northern Company as gathers at these dinners, and by their personal bearing no less than by the earnestness and eloquence of their speeches should show to the most skeptical what worthy foes they had been, and what sincere friends they are.¹

The next Southerner to follow Grady at the New York unit of the society was his old adviser, Henry Watterson, who appeared at the regular meeting December 22, 1897. Watterson was in turn succeeded two years later by William Gordon McCabe. "The ninety-fourth annual banquet which . . . was held in the grand ball room of the Waldorf Astoria . . . was

¹"The New South," (January 1, 1887), XXXI, 3.

declared by many old members of the society to be the most elaborate in their recollection.* Five hundred twenty-eight members and guests attended.¹ The society's Brooklyn chapter was also the scene of reconciliation speaking, when Thomas Nelson Page spoke on sectional unity the day preceding McCabe's address:

The New England Society held its twentieth annual dinner last night in the Pouch Mansion, in Clinton-ave. Over two hundred members and guests were present. The Walls of the dining room were handsomely draped with flags, and over the guest table was hung the blue banner of the society stamped with a large golden seal and the gray Pilgrim rock of 1620.²

During Ulysses S. Grant's long illness and subsequent death he became once more a figure of national reverence. Several organizations were created to honor his memory. Hillary Herbert was present at the annual Grant birthday dinner at the Waldorf Astoria in New York April 27, 1894. Henry Watterson addressed the Grant Monument Association, also at the Waldorf, on the evening of April 27, 1898.

As president of the International Sunday School Union, Alfred Colquitt was invited to address the Brooklyn Sunday School Union at a large hall called the Brooklyn Rink on May 21, 1879, on the fiftieth anniversary of the Union. One account related:

The semi-centennial of the Brooklyn Sunday-school Union was celebrated last evening at the Rink on Claremont-ave. The large building was tastefully decorated. At the Vanderbilt-ave. end was a choir of 1200 boys and girls. In front of the choir was the platform on which were seated among others, Benjamin H. Bayliss, who presided, Governor A. H. Colquitt of Georgia. . . . An audience of about 4000 persons was present.³

¹New York Times, December 23, 1899, p. 2.

²New York Herald, December 22, 1899, p. 10.

³New York Herald, May 22, 1879, p. 8.

Boston was the scene of two additional reunion utterances not connected with the centennial or commercial organizations. Following his address to the Boston Merchants, Henry Grady spoke to the Bay State Club, a predominantly Democratic organization, at a luncheon at the Parker House December 14, 1889. The meeting was presided over by Charles H. Taylor, publisher of the Boston Globe. Grady was "so hoarse he could hardly talk," but spoke on the progress of the South in developing her own industrial resources.¹ John B. Gordon was honored at a public dinner in Boston April 27, 1878, the evening after his address to the Boston Merchants.

One of the two ethnic societies extending invitations for reunion orations was the Philadelphia Scotch-Irish Society, which heard Hillary Herbert on February 15, 1895. The Philadelphia Hibernian Society, which feted Fitzhugh Lee, was the other.

The termination of fighting in Puerto Rico was celebrated in Chicago October 16-21, 1898, with the declaration of a Peace Jubilee. Clark Howell was one of the speakers at a banquet held in connection with the celebration October 19, 1898. The Chicago Tribune gave a detailed account:

President McKinley took dinner with his good friends of Chicago last evening. Exactly 802 men sat down to the feast given by the Jubilee Committee at the Auditorium and every one of them was glad to be there.

The scene was imposing. . . . The large parquet of the Auditorium had been floored over level with the stage, making one great surface on which the tables were placed. Above arched the roof of the great theatre, and the electric lights which studded it threw countless rays downward, which were reflected back from the crystal and china of the tables and brought out the brilliancy of the flowers which adorned

¹Nixon, op. cit., p. 325.

them. Interspersed with the somber black of the attire of the guests were showy uniforms of the blue and gold, worn by the officers of volunteers who had gone to the war, giving a color to an assemblage such as was never seen in this city before.¹

Following his return from Nashua, New Hampshire, Lucius Lamar was dined by the Marshfield Club at the Somerset Clubhouse on Beacon Street, March 9, 1875. This group was a memorial organization to Daniel Webster and the toast always proposed at meetings was "the memory of Daniel Webster, the defender and expounder of the Constitution," to which Lamar on this occasion responded.²

Two other speeches deserve mention here. The first was by Ben Hill to the Society of New York Editors in 1874, the other by Fitzhugh Lee to the New York National Guard. The contacts which Lee made during his visit to the Boston Centennial culminated eight years later in an invitation from the Thirteenth Regiment of the New York National Guard to be its guest at a celebration in his honor. He was given a reception on February 7, 1883, at the armory, and two nights later a banquet at the Mansion House in Brooklyn Heights.³

Unreported Reconciliation Speeches

A number of Southern reconciliation speeches were delivered which might be more fully discussed in this survey if more information were available concerning them. The scene of these speeches was the Philadelphia Centennial celebration and exhibition. The governor of

¹October 20, 1898, p. 2.

²Edward Mayes, Lucius Q. C. Lamar: His Life, Times, and Speeches (Nashville: Methodist Publishing House, 1896), p. 124.

³New York Times, February 10, 1883, p. 5.

each state and territory of the United States was requested to appoint an orator to speak on the history, progress, present condition, and resources of his area. The speeches apparently were delivered at irregular intervals in Judges' Hall during the course of the exhibition. They were to have been included in the official reports of the Centennial, but so few orators furnished copies that all were omitted. Orators from the Southern states who spoke were A. M. West of Mississippi, R. B. Hubbard of Texas, J. C. Brown of Tennessee, T. W. Osborn of Florida, and David Walker of Arkansas.¹ A scrutiny of newspapers and magazines, most of which carried extensive day-to-day accounts of the exhibition, fails to reveal a reference to any of the state orators. Apparently they could not compete in news value with the fascinating mechanical and cultural displays, and all traces of these speeches appear to have vanished except for brief mention in the Centennial report.

Chronological Distribution of Speeches

The first speech meeting the limitations set down in Chapter I was delivered by Ben Hill, probably on October 5, 1868, and the last by William Gordon McCabe December 22, 1899. Between these limits the speeches uncovered during this study are distributed rather evenly. Only for the years 1869-73, 1876, 1879-81, 1885, 1890, and 1896-97 were no speeches discovered. At least eight speeches occurred in 1875, the Boston Centennial year, while probably the highest number, ten, occurred in 1895, when many of the areas of conflict between the sections had

¹U. S. Centennial Commission Reports, International Exhibition, 1876 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), II, 23.

been removed or mitigated. A summary of speeches by year reveals the following distributions: 1868-one; 1874-one; 1875-eight; 1877-five; 1878-four; 1882-one; 1883-five; 1884-one; 1886-one; 1887-five; 1888-one; 1889-two; 1891-one; 1892-two; 1893-one; 1894-four; 1895-ten; 1898-three; 1899-five.

This pattern of Southern reconciliatory speaking indicates that the speakers evidently saw the encouragement of sectional good feeling as a continuing need, rather than as a challenge which reached a high point at some time during the period and then tapered off. Probably the relatively large number of speeches near the end of the period indicates the desire of the orators to capitalize on the decline of anti-Southern agitation which came with the defeat of the federal election bill and with the new nationalism accompanying the Spanish-American war.

Extent of the Primary Audience

Any exact calculation of the total audience which heard these sixty-three speeches is, of course, impossible. The numbers indicated as present on some occasions represent the estimate of only one reporter, and in a few cases, such as in Gordon's tour of Ohio, there were political reasons for deliberately miscalculating the number of auditors. The only presumably exact counts were at some of the dinner meetings, where a certain number of places were set and the dining hall was reported filled to capacity. At some of the dinners, however, visitors were allowed to enter following the meals to hear the speaking, and this disturbs even the accuracy of these calculations. In discovered accounts of speeches, the reports of only forty-one include

estimates of the number of persons present. Such approximate estimates as "hundreds" are not included in this figure. The sum total of recorded estimates of audiences present at the speaking situation amounts to 144,630. This total must be accepted with some reservations, because no accurate evidence is available concerning acoustical conditions under which most of the speeches were delivered. We know, for example, that at the Winnebago County Fair "there were nearly 10,000 people on the ground,"¹ but whether all these persons attempted to hear Hampton's speech cannot be ascertained; neither is it possible to determine whether all who listened were able to hear in the open-air surroundings without the aid of electric amplifying devices. At the Chicago World's Fair, we are told, Watterson spoke near the end of an extremely long program to 100,000 persons present in the huge Arts Hall, and "the vast audience, many of whom could not hear anyway, was rather restless."² Probably this figure of 100,000 auditors, therefore, should be discounted considerably. No evidence is available concerning the audibility of Decoration Day speakers in outdoor settings, such as Watterson, Marshall, Pryor, and others.

As for the twenty-two remaining speeches, where the number of potential auditors is not recorded, little can be determined. The occasions include the reception in Boston Music Hall, at which Andrews and Lee spoke; The Gettysburg reunion, addresses by Gordon; Hampton's Confederate Monument dedication; both of Herbert's speeches; both of Lamar's addresses; Lee's reception speech at Boston and his oration at

¹Chicago Tribune, September 14, 1877, p. 1.

²Ibid., October 22, 1892, p. 10.

Tammany Hall; the addresses of Marshall, Porter, Pryor, Simons, Young, and Watterson's lectures on Lincoln, his address to the Boston Merchants, his Decoration Day speech at Nashville, and his speech to the Grant Monument Association.

Concerning these speeches, purely speculative estimates have been undertaken in an effort to gain at least an approximate idea of the number of auditors. Seven of the addresses were at banquet meetings, which if we may judge from the reported banquets given by the New England Societies and Boston organizations, probably averaged not more than two hundred, or a total of perhaps fourteen hundred. Six were outdoor meetings, most of them on Decoration Day. To judge from the large crowds who commonly turned out to hear Gordon, Hampton, and Watterson, the relative notoriety of Hill, and the smaller popularity of Pryor and Simons, the aggregate of this group of speeches is probably in the neighborhood of three thousand auditors. Andrews and Lee appeared at the same reception in Boston Music Hall, where the audience is described as "vast" and composed of both men on the main floor and ladies in the gallery, who were credited with producing "tremendous cheering," and "a perfect babble of applause."¹ In view of this description and the fact that the reception of the Southerners in Boston was uniformly enthusiastic, an estimate of one thousand persons is not unreasonable. How many men were present at the Governor's reception at the Doric Hall in the Massachusetts Statehouse it is impossible to determine, but the setting suggests a "reception" in the more formal sense, with invited guests, handshaking, and refreshments, which probably limited the affair to perhaps two hundred. Five of the untabulated audiences were at indoor public meetings. As

¹New York Times, June 17, 1875, p. 1.

Gordon had attracted five thousand persons at Cincinnati and an estimated three thousand at Columbus, it can probably be assumed that at least three thousand heard him at Cleveland Music Hall. Lamar spoke in Nashua in a hall of unspecified size. The population of Nashua in 1870, five years before his appearance, was 10,534,¹ so in all probability Lamar had neither an extensive potential audience nor a hall of large capacity. Furthermore, accounts of the speech mention no massive ovations, stating only that the large hall was filled to overflowing.² The total number of auditors was probably one thousand or less. Fitzhugh Lee addressed a Fourth of July celebration in Tammany Hall before a capacity crowd, which means that he was probably heard by at least five thousand persons.³ Watterson's lecture on Lincoln at the Chicago Auditorium was delivered to a "large" audience, probably not less than one thousand, considering that the meeting was under the auspices of the Lincoln Council of the National Lincoln Union and was the eighth public celebration of Lincoln's birthday in his own home state.⁴ The same lecture was given at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, before a "small" audience, perhaps not more than three hundred. A total of these admittedly speculative estimates of the auditors of the remaining twenty-one speeches provides the figure 11,900. Adding this sum to the total of reported auditors

¹U. S. Bureau of the Census, Ninth Census of the United States: 1870. Population, I (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1872), 116.

²Boston Daily Advertiser, March 7, 1875, p. 1.

³"The Tammany Hall Convention," Harper's Weekly, XII (July 18, 1868), 458.

⁴Chicago Tribune, February 13, 1895, p. 3.

provides a grand total of 158,530. If we discount the ambitious estimate of Watterson's World's Fair Auditors by fifty percent, it is possible that as many as 100,000 persons heard the orations delivered on reunion themes by Southern orators in the North.

The necessity of estimating potential attendance for some of the speeches renders a comparison of relative totals of the respective speeches unfair to all speakers involved. Henry Watterson, even if credited with 50,000 auditors at Chicago, had a recorded total of 54,725, plus an estimated 2200 more, or a total of 56,925. At least 12,000 persons probably heard two of Hampton's addresses, to which could be added an estimated five hundred, for a total of 12,500. John B. Gordon spoke to a recorded 9575, plus an estimated 3500, for a total of 13,075. All the other speakers were heard by significantly smaller numbers of auditors, not more than 1000 each on the average.

Extent of the Larger Audiences Reached by Southern Reunion Speeches

In addition to those who were actually present at the delivery of these speeches, reconciliation speakers reached, by newspaper accounts accompanied by enthusiastic or highly critical editorializing, an uncounted number of readers. As noted above, most of the reunion speakers were newsworthy men, and even if they talked only in patriotic generalities, as did Hampton in dedicating the Chicago monument, their words were fairly certain of an airing by the press, ordinarily with a reproduction of all or part of the text. Watterson's Chicago World's Fair address, for example, was carried in the New York Times, New York Herald, Chicago Tribune, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and Cincinnati Enquirer. His speech at the Dayton Soldier's Home was

quoted in the New York Times, Louisville Courier-Journal, and Dayton Daily Journal. Roger Pryor's Memorial Day address in Brooklyn was carried by the New York Herald, the Cincinnati Enquirer, and the Chicago Tribune. Wade Hampton's Auburn speech was published in Harper's Weekly, the New York Herald, and the Springfield Republican. The address of Hillary Herbert on Lincoln appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, the Pittsburgh Gazette, and the Chicago Tribune. The weekly and monthly magazines--such as Harper's Weekly, Nation, Atlantic Monthly, Century, and Independent--infrequently carried texts but often provided interpretative comments.

At least three reconciliation speeches were published as pamphlets or reports. They were Grady's "New South";¹ Alfred M. Waddell's "The Confederate Soldier";² Watterson's "Abraham Lincoln."³ No information could be procured about the sales and distribution of any of these pamphlets. The contents of the New England Society report suggest that the report was apparently distributed to members, which probably indicates a circulation of not more than five hundred copies.⁴ Certainly the proceedings did not enjoy any great popular circulation. Waddell's speech, published by a prominent publishing house of the time and evidently offered for sale, if one may so judge from the

¹In "Eighty-First Anniversary Celebration of the New England Society in the City of New York, at Delmonico's, December 22, 1886." Bound in "Dawson Pamphlets," XLIII, nos. 15-29. Unpublished collection at University of North Carolina library.

²(Washington: J. L. Pearson, 1878).

³An oration delivered before the Lincoln Union by Henry Watterson, auditorium, Chicago, February 12, 1895 (Louisville: Courier Journal, 1899).

⁴The pamphlet was finally located by the writer in a private collection at the University of North Carolina library.

fifty cent price stated on the cover, probably enjoyed the widest distribution of any of the circularized speeches. Given as it was to benefit survivors of Union veterans, it probably possessed some sales appeal for G. A. R. members, both those who heard the speech and those who did not. Watterson's Lincoln lecture was heard by thousands of persons in the South and in the North, and presumably some of them would have been interested in securing a printed copy. The fact that it was published by his own newspaper, however, indicates that it did not receive the national promotion which it might have enjoyed with a more prominent publisher.

Any exact estimate as to the number of persons who read texts of or comments about the reconciliation speeches by Southerners in the North is impossible on the basis of available evidence but the speeches of most of them were news in the most popular publications of the time, which indicates that several hundred thousand persons had the opportunity to become aware of the addresses.

Chapter Summary

The extent of Southern attempts to restore good feeling in the North by means of reconciliatory speeches has been considerably underestimated. There has also been a tendency to place undue emphasis on one or two speeches as accomplishing most of the task of reconciliation. Most of the individuals who undertook reconciliatory speaking were prominent, either regionally or nationally, and tended to be active in politics and journalism. They came from a variety of Southern states, South Carolina and Virginia claiming most of them. Most of the speeches were motivated by the demands of the

occasion, such as commemorating centennials, dedicating memorials, and the like. A few, however, had other purposes than those stated by the speakers, such as forestalling legislation or reassuring investors. Speeches were given in nine Northern states, with New York and Boston the scene of a majority. Occasions for the speeches included centennials, commercial organizations, fairs, political meetings, veterans' organizations, Decoration Days, public lectures, and a variety of miscellaneous meetings. Chronologically, the speeches were distributed rather evenly between 1868 and 1899. They were heard by a primary audience of perhaps 100,000 persons and their speeches were presented by the press to an estimated larger audience of several hundred thousand.

CHAPTER III

A SURVEY OF RECURRENT ISSUES AND MODES OF PROOF IN SOUTHERN RECONCILIATION ORATORY

This chapter attempts to draw generalizations concerning the ideas most frequently stated and elaborated by Southern reconciliatory speakers in the North, and to discuss the logical, ethical, and emotional techniques that they most frequently employed in supporting their arguments.

Major Recurrent Themes

It should be noted that Southern reconciliation speakers did not function as representatives of any society or organization. Consequently, it is to be expected that, acting as individuals, they presented a great variety of arguments which fell under the broad heading of "reconciliatory." A number of ideas, however, were sufficiently common to many of the speeches that they may be termed representative of the beliefs with which the reunion speakers wished to indoctrinate their listeners.

"The South is Loyal to the Union"

The concept most commonly expressed by the speakers, one which appeared in twenty-five of the discovered speeches, was that the South had ceased to lament the dead Confederacy and had become a loyal and

devoted part of the Union once more. Speeches containing this utterance were uniformly distributed throughout the period. Ben Hill employed it with reservation in 1868 in the first discovered reunion speech, and Thomas Nelson Page utilized it in the last such speech of the period. That the argument was so popular and so well distributed is not unexpected, since an assurance that the Southerners were once again willing to join wholeheartedly in the Union was presumably basic to all other reunion sentiments that might be advanced.

Hill grudgingly stated the idea as follows: "The South conceded at Appomattox that the arguments of the ablest statesmen America ever produced in favor of the right of secession as a constitutional remedy had been replied to in the only manner they could be effectually replied to, by physical force; and the South consented that this judgment, written by the sword, should have legal force and effect."¹

Hillary Herbert, speaking at a Grant birthday celebration, referred to a recent Confederate veteran's convention in Birmingham and stated:

They met to do honor to the virtues of those who had died by their side. . . . And yet, I say to you, gentlemen, what I know to be true, that in all this gathering of ex-Confederates there was not one sentiment of disloyalty to the flag of the Union, that floated over their heads while they deliberated. More than a quarter of a century has elapsed, and not a State Legislature or a State Convention or a County Convention, or even a school-boy's debating society has taken up that question of State sovereignty for discussion.²

Roger Pryor relinquished the ideal of the Confederacy as follows: "I

¹DePew, op. cit., X, 278.

²New York Times, April 28, 1895, p. 4.

for one cannot resist the conclusions that, after all, Providence wisely ordered the event, and that it is well for the South itself that it was disappointed in its endeavor to establish a separate government."¹ For the most part this recurring idea was stated simply, with little elaboration or supporting argument.

"The South Fought Bravely for a Cause which She Cherished"

Thirteen of the speakers stated that the South actually was not rebellious in participating in the Civil War, because she acted in accordance with principles in which she earnestly believed; the South was no more "wrong" than the North was "right." What mattered was the bravery and integrity with which the South had fought. This argument was stated and applied in somewhat different ways by the speakers employing it. Outspoken Ben Hill told the New York editors candidly:

My heart responds fully to the love of the Union. In the midst of the war there never was a time when I could not utter, "Would to God that we could have the Union as it was." We differ as to its meaning, and the reason is because we don't know each other. Put yourself in my place. We are called rebels for doing what we thought right and our duty. We should learn charity for others. We ought not to think any less of others for thinking differently from us. If you think I am a rebel, it is your right; I think differently, as is my right. What good does it do you to tell me what you think.²

Extreme as this idea may seem, it was heard in such exclusive company as the New England Society as well as in the mass political rally. To cite other examples, in his speech to the Cincinnati Democrats John B. Gordon dwelt upon it at some length:

¹New York Herald, May 31, 1877, p. 2.

²New York Times, June 9, 1874, p. 10.

Well, we tried to go out of the Union and for that reason you ought to think we were pretty honest about it, for we gathered around that effort a cordon of as brave breasts as were ever exposed to battle. We gave to the support of that conviction all our courage, all our faith, all our talent, all our wealth, our blood, our prayers, our churches, our manhood and our womanhood, and we went down at last stripped of all, prostrated and bleeding, or we would have been fighting yet, I reckon.

Well, I am showing you that we were honest in our convictions.¹

Henry Grady was able to say to the New Englanders without criticism:

The South has nothing for which to apologize. She believes that the late struggle between the States was war and not rebellion, revolution and not conspiracy, and her convictions were as honest as yours. I should be unjust to the dauntless spirit of the South and to my own convictions if I did not make this plain in this presence. The South has nothing to take back.²

Henry Watterson likewise told his Dayton audience of veterans that there was a war in which he had served one side and they another; that each had done his best on his own side because all were creatures of circumstance. He hoped that no one had any regret concerning the part borne in the fighting, because if a man were brave and honest, a true soldier and a good man, it did not matter on which side he fought.³

Wade Hampton's version of the idea occurred at Rockford, Illinois. Up to the outbreak of the war, he said, he had used all his influence to prevent it, but when it came he obeyed the command of his state and fought as long and hard as he was able. After being defeated, he surrendered in good faith. The Northerners followed the dictates of their consciences in acting as they did, he said, and the Southerners

¹Cincinnati Enquirer, October 29, 1887, p. 8.

²New England Society, op. cit., p. 9.

³Dayton Daily Journal, June 5, 1878, p. 3.

did the same.¹

Concomitant with this argument was a variation supplied by a number of the speakers to the effect that the war had resulted from two equally honest but diametrically opposed interpretations of the Constitution. The most poetic expression of this variant was in Wade Hampton's speech at Rockford, when he described two knights-errant who approached from opposite directions a shield planted at a cross-road. They fell to disputing its color, since the shield was white on one side and black on the other, and since neither knight could see both sides. The argument reached such proportions that they engaged in deadly combat to maintain their respective positions. The shield, Hampton said, represented the Constitution, while the knights were the North and South. The latter, having had it demonstrated by force that she was wrong, was willing to accept the verdict of defeat.

Other less allegorical interpretations were provided by Watterson, Gordon, Lee, and Waddell. Watterson told the Army of the Tennessee:

The framers of the Constitution found themselves unable to fix decisively and to define accurately the exact relation of the States to the Federal Government. On that point they left what may be described as an "open clause," and through that open clause, as through an open door, the grim spectre of disunion stalked.²

At Cincinnati, Gordon explained about secession:

Well, we want out, or tried to. The North took a different view. We had different theories about this business. I was

¹Chicago Tribune, September 14, 1877, p. 3.

²Henry Watterson, The Compromises of Life (New York: Duffield and Company, 1906), p. 298.

born in the belief, and I think every man in that whole section was reared in it, nearly every man; some few differed, but the overwhelming majority of the Southern people were born and reared and imbued with the belief that each state had a right to sever its connection with the Union whenever it thought its interest demanded it.¹

Lee stated simply that the war was unavoidable because it was based on "different constructions of the Constitution," while Waddell explained that although there was much disagreement in the South about the abstract right of secession, everyone agreed that the first responsibility of the individual was to his state.

From these examples it may be seen that the Constitutional argument was only a variant of the basic assertion that the war was fought and decided, not on the basis of right, but of superior military strength.

"The Politicians Are Preventing Reunion"

Another rather frequently recurring theme involved the charge that the people of the North and South earnestly desired peace and good will, but that diabolical politicians kept the division alive for selfish reasons. Chronologically, this assertion appeared ten times, all, except for Hill's 1868 speech, between 1875 and 1889. During this period "bloody shirt" oratory was prevalent and the Southerners presumably attempted to build good will by blaming sectional animosity on the politicians. Indictments of "bloody shirt" politicians appeared as might be expected, in all of John B. Gordon's Ohio speeches against J. B. Foraker, a Republican Radical, as well as in Hampton's speech at Auburn and Lamar's address to the Democrat-sponsored meeting at Nashua.

¹Cincinnati Enquirer, October 28, 1887, p. 8.

Gordon expressed the same argument at Cincinnati as follows:

I have never had in this heart of mine one solitary thought of bitterness toward any Republican of the North who was honest in his convictions, and only have I felt hostility toward the creature who for the sake of political power could teach your children to hate mine.

Liberty in a Government like ours must live, if it lives at all, in the intelligence and virtue and cooperation of all the people. How are you going to perpetuate cooperation for the future generation if you teach your children that the children of the Southern country are unworthy of cooperation or confidence? This thing is so far reaching that the plummet has never been made long enough to sound the depths of infamy of the men who would perpetuate those animosities.¹

Alfred Waddell told his New York veteran audience in 1875 that

now and then, but less and less frequently, demagogues, for sinister purposes, make spasmodic efforts to rekindle the dying embers of our late conflagration, but public sentiment condemns all such efforts, and they will soon cease altogether. Your invitation, and my presence here this evening in answer to it, furnish the strongest proof that the capital for that trade is exhausted. It has been carried on, on both sides, principally by men who, whatever else they may have shed, did not spill an alarming quantity of blood during the war, and are not recognized by their countrymen as heroes of the civil strife. . . . Let them continue to afford us amusement now, as they excited our contempt then. The Union will probably survive if the career of the wordy warriors does not.²

Grady, speaking before the New England Society in 1886, offered a refutation to the alleged enemies of union by stating:

There may be men, and there are, who insist on getting up fratricidal strife, and who infamously fan the embers of war that they may raise them again into a blaze. But just as certain as there is a God in the heavens, when those noisy insects of the hour have perished in the heat that gave them life and their pestilent lives have ceased, the great clock of this Republic will strike the slow-moving, the tranquil hours. . . .³

¹Ibid., October 29, 1887, p. 5.

²Waddell, op. cit., p. 1f.

³New England Society, op. cit., p. 18.

Ben Hill, characteristically less diplomatic than his successors, did not limit his denunciation to the politicians, stating: "Shame on the leaders who persist in such charges; and shame upon a people who will sustain such leaders!"¹

Other Recurrent Themes

In addition to the above arguments, at least three others appear as many as nine times in the speeches. These include an expression of desire for the South to control all matters considered her own affair, a profession of the Southern white as the Negro's best friend, and a proclamation that Grant set the keynote for peace. As presented, the first argument took a reconciliatory form because it represented a plea by the Southerners to be allowed to demonstrate voluntarily their acceptance of the ideals of the unbreakable Union, abolition, and the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. The reason for the plea was probably less idealistic. As might be anticipated, the expression of desire for local self-government came most frequently in the early years of the movement, during the existence of the Freedmen's Bureau, during the passage of the amendments, and as a part of the attempts of Southern Democrats to regain control of state governments. The first expression of this idea is to be found in Hill's address to the Democratic Union in 1868, where he spoke upon it at some length, commenting on the presence of troops in the South and the edicts of the Freedmen's Bureau. Of the latter, Hill noted:

The next claim by Congress was the right to separate the populations of the Southern states, and withdraw the negroes

¹Depew, op. cit., X, 276ff.

from the absolute government of the States and place them under the government of the Freedman's Bureau. On this arose quite a quarrel between the President and Congress. . . . The South submitted, and the Bureau was allowed to run its course of outrage upon the whites and of speculation on the poor blacks.¹

Concerning eligibility for office, Hill discussed disfranchisement of ex-Rebels under the Fourteenth Amendment as a violation of the right of the people to choose their own officers and representatives.²

Developing another aspect of the "home rule" argument, Roger Pryor commented in 1877, "The scheme of the Administration by which the civil was made subordinate to the military power of the state has fallen at last."³ Lucius Lamar at Nashua, N. H., made a direct appeal on the issue:

Southerners all believe and feel, in their shattered condition, that their hope and the hope of the American people is the preservation of the Union. They are ready to rally around your flag, which for the last ten years has been to them not an emblem of protection, but an emblem of force. Just vouchsafe to them the benefits of government as you enjoy them yourselves; give them the right of local self-government; that is all they ask, and they will teach their children to lip, "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."⁴

Henry Grady fourteen years later discussed the matter in far more abstract terms, proclaiming that the struggle then raging was a "fight against the consolidation of power, the concentration of wealth, the diminution of local sovereignty and the dwarfing of the individual citizen," an evident reference to legislative action then

¹Ibid., p. 280.

²Ibid.

³Cincinnati Enquirer, May 31, 1877, p. 2.

⁴Boston Daily Advertiser, March 7, 1875, p. 1.

pending for the Federal supervision of local polling-places.¹ Hillary Herbert, ex-Navy secretary, was able to dismiss the issue of local self-government in 1895 with the comment: "The time has passed when might makes right, whether for individuals or for nations. Our national government must do what is right unto all its people."²

"The Southerner is the Negro's Best Friend"

At least nine of the speakers chose to discuss the question of rights for the freedmen, proclaiming in one manner or another that the Negro's lot was improving rapidly under Southern tutelage, and that his welfare could be safely entrusted to his former masters. Ben Hill was the first to enunciate this doctrine, announcing in 1868:

The South will not re-enslave the Negro. She did not enslave him in the first place. That was your work. The South took your slave-savage and gave him the highest civilization ever reached by the Negro.³

Later in the same speech, Hill emphasized that the South was best able to care for the new citizens by stating in his elaboration of the Civil Rights Bill:

The negro being free and deprived of the protection of his master, was entitled to the equal protection of the law and to absolute equal rights. To show you how unnecessary was the confusion created by Congress on this subject, I will state that before Congress had passed this Civil Rights bill, of which it boasts so much, the Legislature of Georgia had passed a bill giving absolute equal rights to the negro, in language almost precisely the same with that afterward adopted by Congress.⁴

¹Turpin, op. cit., p. 280.

²Chicago Tribune, February 16, 1895, p. 20.

³Depew, op. cit., I, 278.

⁴Hill, op. cit., p. 322.

He expressed the same thought to the New York editors, stating that he thanked God that no slave remained in America. The interest of the South, he said, was to elevate and enlighten them because she was directly affected by the power they exerted. Having lived with the Negroes for many years, the South better understood how they might be elevated and educated.¹

Three years later, Wade Hampton told an audience that he owed his election to the colored men of South Carolina. They voted for him, he said, because they knew him to be a good friend of their race, the first after the war to uphold Negro suffrage. The intention in his state was to elevate and educate them and show them the responsibilities and blessings of liberty.²

Grady devoted an entire speech at Boston in 1889 to the race problem, discussing the magnitude of the task faced by the Southern whites in being stewards for such a vast number of freedmen, and assuring his listeners a number of times that the people of the South could most adequately promote the welfare of their charges because they knew them best. He had expressed the same view to the New England Society three years before, when he proclaimed:

No section shows a more prosperous laboring population than the Negroes of the South, none in fuller sympathy with the employing and land-owning class. He shares our school-fund, has the fullest protection of our laws and the friendship of our people. Self-interest as well as honor demand that he should have this. Our future, our very existence depend upon our working our problem out in a full and exact justice.³

¹New York Times, June 7, 1874, p. 10.

²New York Herald, June 21, 1877, p. 3.

³New England Society, op. cit., p. 8.

The most outspoken advocate of allowing the Southern whites to plot the future of the Negro was Thomas Nelson Page, who in 1899 told the New England Society:

Among the problems which confront us is one that is like the pestilence that walketh in darkness, but the key to it, in our opinion, is that for the present, at least, the white race is the torchbearer of civilization, and never again will the white people of the South consent to be dominated by a weaker race. They are standing today between you and this problem, but we are ready today to do full justice to that people. I have many friends among them, but it is the race I stand against.¹

In Page's blunt statement was no such grandiloquent pronouncement of Negro progress as that made by Gordon in 1887, when he had announced: "These colored men have been educated. Large numbers of them are graduates and speak several languages. They are intelligent, read the newspapers, study the records, and know where their true interests lie."²

"Grant Set the Keynote of Peace"

At least nine of the speakers saw the symbolism of Grant's generosity in his treatment of Lee at Appomattox as a potential keynote for all North-South relations. This idea was frequently combined with praise of Grant's bravery during his dying days, as well as when he was a soldier. Hill said of Appomattox:

General Grant was truly great on that memorable day of defeat and magnanimity. Now see also the most happy effect which that day's work produced. . . . Those noble terms of justice and good faith, granted with the magnanimous spirit exhibited by General Grant, sheathed every sword of vengeance.³

¹New York Times, December 22, 1899, p. 9.

²Cincinnati Enquirer, October 29, 1887, p. 8.

³Hill, op. cit., p. 320.

In his ringing peroration before the New Englanders, Henry Grady demanded in 1886: "Will she [New England] withhold, save in strained courtesy, the hand which straight from his soldier's heart Grant offered to Lee at Appomattox?"¹

John B. Gordon attempted to capitalize most heavily of all on Grant's spirit, as exemplified by the following excerpt from his Cincinnati speech in 1887:

I am here to invoke the spirit that actuated that great Captain, Ulysses S. Grant, in the last hours of his life. I had rather be Grant, dead and buried . . . than to be the living, active, triumphant agent of such a passion as is sought to be perpetuated here.

What would you think here to-night if that great soldier could look down from the battlements of high upon a scene like this? What think you he would say to the men who are seeking to put to the blush the spirit with which he died, manifesting to his countrymen with almost his last words, as his eyes turned about to look upon his country, he exclaimed, "Thank God the Country is at last united."²

Wade Hampton did not miss the opportunity to tell his soldier audience in 1895 that "I have often thought that if the two great Captains who were engaged in that death grapple in Virginia had been left to settle the terms of peace . . . the country would have had a peace indeed, one honorable alike to victors and vanquished, and which would have prevented the evils brought about by the politicians." He later added, "As it is, the South recognizes and honors the magnanimity of Gen. Grant toward our great chief, Gen. Lee. . . ."³ Thomas Nelson Page expressed the idea in words almost identical with Hampton's.

¹New England Society, op. cit., p. 19.

²Cincinnati Enquirer, October 29, 1887, p. 8.

³New York Times, May 31, 1895, p. 1.

When Watterson spoke before the Grant Memorial Association in 1898, he noted: "It was Gen. Grant himself who issued the order finally withdrawing the troops from the Southern states, and when we remember that it was none other than Grant who stood between the Confederate soldier and surrender that might have been dishonoring to American manhood, the debt we owe our great Captain becomes incalculable."¹

Only Watterson chose to make reference to Grant's administration, the other speakers choosing to describe him only as a military leader. In commenting on his period as president, the speaker remarked:

I never allowed myself to make his acquaintance until he had quitted the White House. The period of his political activity was full of uncouth and unsparing partisan contention. It was a kind of Civil War. . . . I met him for the first time beneath my own vine and fig-tree, and a happy series of accidents, thereafter, gave the opportunity to meet him often and to know him well. He was the embodiment of simplicity, integrity, and courage; every inch a general, a soldier, and a man; but, in the circumstances of his last illness, a figure of heroic proportions for the contemplation of the ages.²

The unofficial but spontaneous beautification of Grant following an illness and death anxiously attended by the nation provided a theme on which all the Southern reunion speakers could rely for a favorable response.

"Lincoln Was a Sincere Friend of the South"

Grant, however, was not the only Northern hero to gain his share of praise. Tribute was paid to Abraham Lincoln in at least eight

¹Ibid., April 28, 1898, p. 4.

²Watterson, op. cit., p. 298.

of the speeches. Like Grant, he was frequently indicated as the exemplar of just conduct of the North toward the South and "the best friend the South ever had." There was, however, a particular advantage for the South in her profession of love for Lincoln. The rumor that Booth had been under the pay of the Confederate government at the time he assassinated the president gained wide acceptance in the North. Even after its decline the attitude persisted that even if the Rebels were not directly responsible, they still endorsed the action. Though the speakers never mentioned this matter, they seemed eager to assure their listeners that the South loved Lincoln and sorrowed at his death.

The most elaborate encomium was Watterson's lecture on Lincoln, while Hillary Herbert's speech at the Pennsylvania Scotch-Irish society was also in praise of Lincoln. Both speakers expressed the admiration of the South for Lincoln and her sorrow at his death. Less formal statements of Lincoln's greatness and of his friendship to the South are found in other speeches, such as Watterson's address to the New England Society in which he quoted Grady as stating that the typical American had come in the person of Lincoln, and in his address at the Nashville Cemetery, where he commented that "the assassination of Abraham Lincoln is lamented in the South hardly less than in the North."¹ Wade Hampton referred to Lincoln in his monument dedication at Chicago, stating that:

the untimely death of President Lincoln was regarded by all thoughtful men of the South as one of the most serious evils which had befallen our section, and I venture to say

¹New York Herald, May 31, 1877, p. 4.

that my Southern associates here present will sustain my assertion. We know that during the war he devoted every energy of body for a restoration of the Union, and that result accomplished, we felt that his big kind heart would prompt him to deal kindly and leniently with his fellow-citizens of the South. It was a cruel fate that deprived him of what he hoped would be the reward of his labors and the South of one who would have been her strongest protector in her sorest hour of need.¹

"The Nation Needs a Unifying War"

An interpretation of the conditions necessary to restore a feeling of nationalism to the country was described by seven of the speakers, who maintained that unity could best be accomplished through a foreign war in which the men of the North and South were called upon to fight as comrades, as they had done in the wars with Britain and Mexico. Until 1898, this idea took the form of a prediction; following the outbreak of the war with Spain, the orators pronounced that the result had been achieved.

Alfred Waddell was the first Southern orator to articulate in the North the possible efficacy of war in achieving unity, stating in 1875:

When in the future it [the flag] shall be unfurled in war the Confederate soldier will be found beneath it, ready to give his life in its defense. If such occasion should ever occur I think the boys in blue would hardly object to touch elbows with him, and would rather enjoy the "old rebel yell" he would raise. No one desires to see war who has ever had the experience of it, but if it should come the spectacle of a solid column composed of alternate regiments of ex-Union and ex-Confederate soldiers would be a goodly sight to see. The thought of such a spectacle is inspiring and quickens the pulse. The realization of it would "provoke the silent dust" of our dead comrades, and would bring upon the winds of heaven the soft music of their common benediction.²

¹New York Times, May 31, 1895, p. 1.

²Waddell, op. cit., p. 22f.

A more positive articulation of this sentiment is found in John B. Gordon's speech in Cleveland in 1887. Here he announced: "I have sometimes thought that I would be willing to see one more war, that we might march under the stars and stripes, shoulder to shoulder, against a common foe."¹ In 1895, Gordon again called for a war which would unite the sections, proclaiming: "We call the fettered millions of earth to follow our lead and strike for republican liberty. As the vanguard, the color-bearers in the march of nations, we lift aloft this banner of freedom and bid universal humanity to catch its inspiration."²

Virtually all the reunion speeches given during 1898 and 1899 convey the idea that the war aided in achieving reunion. For example, much of Clark Howell's address at the Chicago Peace Jubilee in 1898, celebrating the capture of Puerto Rico dwelt on the blessings of the war with Spain:

. . . only from the crucible of war could come the answer. And, thank God, that answer has been made in the record of the war, the peaceful termination of which we celebrate to-night.

. . .
But speaking as a Southerner and an American, I say that this [the acquisition of a foreign empire] has been as naught compared to the greatest good this war has accomplished. Drawing alike from all sections of this Union for her heroes and her martyrs, depending alike upon north, south, east, and west for her glorious victories . . . America stands today the holy emblem of a household in which the children abide in unity, equality, love and peace.³

¹Dayton Daily Journal, November 1, 1887, p. 3.

²Thomas B. Reed, Modern Eloquence (Philadelphia: John D. Morris and Co., 1900), III, 494.

³Ibid., II, 648f.

"North and South Bear Responsibility for Slavery"

While it was never made a major issue in any of the speeches, a number of the Southern orators did not hesitate to point out in passing that after all it had been Yankee traders who had introduced slavery into America, so that the moral burden did not lie solely with the Southern slaveholders. This idea, when expressed, was often coupled with a declaration that the South did not fight the Civil War to protect the institution of slavery. Ben Hill dealt with the matter on a monetary basis, stating that "The South, by her own act, made valid the emancipation of her slaves in the only way in which emancipation could be made valid, and thus gave up the property the North sold her, without compensation."¹

Watterson stressed the responsibility of the North for slavery in three of his reunion speeches, using such phrases as "A joint heritage of woe," and a sin "to be wiped out and expiated in blood and flames." To the Army of the Tennessee he gave this analysis:

In the beginning all of us were guilty and equally guilty, for African slavery. It was the good fortune of the North first to find out that slave labor was not profitable. So, very sensibly, it sold its slaves to the South, which, very disastrously, pursued the delusion.²

Henry Grady, discussing the race problem in Boston in 1889, charged:

The slave ships of the republic sailed from your ports, the slaves worked our fields. You will not defend the traffic, nor will I defend the institution.³

¹Depew, op. cit., I, 277.

²Watterson, op. cit., p. 297.

³Turpin, op. cit., p. 247.

He treated the subject more lightly before the New England Society, when he quipped, "Your fathers--not to be blamed for parting with what didn't pay, sold their slaves to our fathers--not to be praised for knowing a paying thing when they saw it."¹ John B. Gordon, speaking before the Commercial Club in Boston, called slavery an institution "which we had not made with our own hands, an institution which was not of our choosing." This argument appears to have been significant for reconciliation because it represented an attempt to shift to Northern shoulders some of the burden of the Negro problem, the most frequently raised of all the points of disagreement between the sections, without asking the Northerners to join in a mutual solution.

The Loyal South Still Reveres the Confederacy

Still another idea considered important and employed by Gordon, Grady, Hampton, Herbert, and Watterson was that homage to the symbols of the Confederacy was not synonymous with any disloyalty to the Union. If the Southerners were discovered holding rallies centered around the symbols of the old Confederacy, many Northerners reasoned that this was an act bordering on open rebellion which indicated that the Southerners had not accepted the results of the Civil War. Obviously, any Southerner speaking in the North following such a rally and speaking of peace and union ran the danger of being accused of duplicity. Gordon, speaking in Ohio, stressed in his Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland speeches that his part in the recent celebration at Macon honoring Jefferson Davis was not to his discredit. He

¹New England Society, op. cit., p. 22.

defended himself at Cincinnati by saying:

The proof of your [Gordon's] disloyalty is that you have in the last few days been cheering Jefferson Davis. Yes, so we have. Does that mean war? Suppose we did cheer Jefferson Davis, would you have us turn our backs upon a gray-haired man, who at our bidding and by the united voice of his whole people, assumed the position which he had? What did he do that I have not done? I don't think I ever shot any body, but I tried to very hard. Why you are asking me to turn a cold shoulder to the wife of my youth, for she not only sympathized with me, but sent me to the front, followed me in the camp. . . . Shall I cease to love her? My countrymen, if we should turn our backs upon Jefferson Davis, and refuse him our sympathy, we would merit the contempt and scorn of every brave man in this audience.¹

Gordon made virtually identical defenses of his action regarding Davis in speaking at Columbus and Cleveland. Henry Grady had proclaimed the previous year that he would not cease to honor his father because he had died in a Confederate uniform, and that although he would send his children's children to the foot of a monument in Athens, Georgia, to pay homage to the senior Grady, this reverent attitude did not constitute disloyalty to the Union. Hillary Herbert alluded to a Confederate memorial celebration in Birmingham as follows:

During this week there has been a gathering in that city of those who fought against the union in these States. They met to do honor to the virtues of those who had died by their side, to rekindle the friendships that were formed around the camp fires and cemented on the battlefields, and to devise means to relieve as they might the wants and sufferings of such of their comrades as were in need of help. They had not ceased, and they never will cease to do honor to the brave men who fell by their sides.²

"Puritan and Cavalier Are Now Americans"

Although the above-mentioned themes represent all the ideas

¹Cincinnati Enquirer, October 29, 1887, p. 8.

²New York Times, April 28, 1894, p. 5.

which were expressed seven or more times by the discovered reunion orators, attention should perhaps be directed to the Puritan-Cavalier theme which formed the basis of two of the speeches and was a major part of another. It occurred all three times before the New England Society of New York. Henry Grady was the first to employ it, stressing in 1886 that presumably all the residents of his section were Cavaliers, while the forebears of his listeners were undeniably Puritans. He smilingly attacked the belief that the Puritan-Cavalier distinction had long survived, however, stating that both Puritan and Cavalier were lost in the storm of the first Revolution; and the American citizen, supplanting both and stronger than either, took possession of the Republic. . . .¹ After a century of cross-breeding, the typical American, Abraham Lincoln, arose, "the sum of Puritan and Cavalier."¹

Henry Watterson, taking the same platform eleven years later, announced that he would begin where Grady left off. Assuming the position of an impartial Scotch-Irish observer, he cited a great number of examples of contradictions in type which he identified as indicating that from the Revolution to the present day both Puritans and Cavaliers had been consistently Americans. This was done to demonstrate the historic oneness of the country and to deny the basis of sectional division. William Gordon McCabe, when his turn came to address the New Englanders, did not hesitate to adopt the proven theme, with a speech resembling Watterson's.

¹New England Society, op. cit., p. 22.

Summary of Recurrent Themes

The most widely-repeated theme of the Southern reconciliation orators was that the South had forsaken the Confederacy and had become a loyal and devoted part of the Union once more. Thirteen of the speakers stated that the South was not rebellious in participating in the Civil War, but that the conflict arose from an honest difference of opinion. A variant of this idea proposed by some of the speakers was that a vagueness in the Constitution had led to the difference of opinion on the matter of secession. As a means of counteracting "bloody-shirt" politicians, several of the Southerners alleged that the country wanted peace, but was being kept divided by these selfish politicians. Three other arguments appearing at least nine times each concerned the desire of the South for self-government, the improvement of the Negro under Southern tutelage, and recognition of the greatness of Grant. Tribute was likewise paid to Lincoln. Several speakers called for a war to reunite the sections, while three orators spoke almost entirely on a Puritan-Cavalier theme.

Prevailing Modes of Proof

Just as recurrent themes are observable in the speeches of reconciliation given by Southerners in the North, so a considerable similarity is evident in the means by which the speakers tried to make these ideas acceptable.¹ This section provides an overview of the means of proof employed by the entire group of speakers considered

¹A detailed analysis of the techniques of proof of John B. Gordon, Wade Hampton, Fitzhugh Lee, and Henry Watterson in their Northern reunion speeches has been undertaken in Chapter IV.

in the study.

Logical Proof

Reasoning from general propositions.--One of the most frequently employed methods of logical demonstration appearing in the reconciliation addresses was the statement of a general proposition from which a conclusion was deduced. In view of the conditions under which the speakers addressed their audiences, this is not surprising. With few exceptions, such as John B. Gordon's Ohio speeches, Wade Hampton's address at Auburn and Lucius Lamar's comments at Nashua, the banquets and Decoration Day ceremonies which formed the occasions of the speeches did not demand sharp analyses, clear-cut logical demonstrations, or lengthy strings of examples. Furthermore, the Northern press was charitable with the speakers who did not probe too deeply into the current political situation, a further inducement to deal in generalities. Even the heaviest discovered attack by Northern journalists upon a Southern speaker, that of the Dayton Journal and the Cleveland Leader upon John B. Gordon during his Ohio swing, was directed less against the ideas he expressed at Cincinnati than against his own character and conduct as an ex-Confederate and as Governor of Georgia. Thus, without apparent fear of contradiction, he was able to say of the colored population of his state: "These colored men have been educated and large numbers of them are graduates and speak several languages."

Among the speakers who made extensive use of general propositions in presenting logical arguments were Henry Grady in his "New South" and Boston Merchants addresses; Ben Hill to the Democratic

Union; Wade Hampton at Auburn, New York, and Rockford, Illinois, and John B. Gordon at Cincinnati. Providing the premise that great types of humanity were slow to mature, Grady concluded that Abraham Lincoln had arisen as the product of generations of Puritan and Cavalier interbreeding. He added: "He was greater than Puritan, greater than Cavalier, in that he was American." Still speaking of Lincoln, the orator called upon his audience to concentrate in developing the Lincoln type, and the "in our common glory as Americans there will be plenty and to spare for your forefathers and for mine." In evaluating the merits of the South, Grady stated the general proposition: "Age does not endow all things with strength and virtue, nor are all new things to be despised." He concluded from this that both the Old and New South had meritorious aspects.¹ Ben Hill stated the major premise that integrity is the highest criteria for evaluating human action. He then asserted that the South believed honestly, fought bravely, and surrendered frankly, and therefore deserved the most ample credit. Discussing the intent of the South, Hill noted: "Power is the only guaranty of fidelity in criminals," and reasoned from this that if the North believed that Southerners were criminals, then the only course of action was to abandon the Constitution completely and govern with power forever. Hill reasoned from the premise that it was impossible for free institutions to be maintained in an atmosphere of distrust to conclude that if the North continued to subscribe to the harangues of disunion agitators then the Union and the Constitution must ultimately be undermined and perish.²

¹Nixon, op. cit., pp. 340-43.

²Depew, op. cit., X, 276. See the appropriate sections of Chapter IV for the use of general propositions by Hampton, Gordon, Lee and Watterson.

Among the reunion speeches, those in which the speaker attempted relatively few times to present arguments enthymematically or by reasoning from general propositions were Hill's address to the New York Editors, Pryor's Decoration Day address, and McCabe to the New England Society.

In summary, general propositions were employed to a greater extent than any other means of logical reasoning by the Southern reconciliation orators. This is probably because the speakers were not often called upon to defend their assertions, either immediately in platform debate, or later in answer to attacks from the press.

Reasoning from example.---Though not so popular as the use of general propositions, examples were employed as a basis of reasoning at least eighty times in the speeches examined. Interestingly enough, Hill's speech on "The Perils of the Nation," and Gordon's address at Cincinnati again lead the list, the former containing at least twenty-three instances of reasoning from example, while the latter utilizes thirteen or more. This device was employed much less frequently by the majority of the speakers, with many of the shorter speeches, particularly in response to greetings, containing none at all. This latter group includes such speeches as those of Garnett Andrews, James G. Porter and Fitzhugh Lee at the Boston Centennial receptions, and Portlock and Ball at the return of a battle flag.

Apparently most of the speakers did not feel challenged to supply lengthy series of examples in support of their assertions. The rather abundant use of examples by Gordon and Hill probably indicates that they were desirous of establishing their case on a firmer basis before their critical audiences than those speakers who employed only

generalities. In attempting to establish that the South had accepted the terms of peace imposed by the military, Congress, and the President, Hill listed five samples of the obedient conduct of the region: the South conceded that secession was invalid by surrendering at Appomattox; the South gave up her slaves without protest and without recompense; Confederate debts were solemnly repudiated; the South did not attempt to hinder Congress in setting up the Freedmen's Bureau; the South agreed to make the Negroes citizens and to extend to them the protection of the law and opportunities for education. Later he listed the steps in the development of the republic during the preceding seventy years: greater wealth and happiness than the world had ever seen; an increase in population from three to thirty million white citizens and from three thousand to four million black citizens; from a scattering of people along the Atlantic coast to a continental distribution of population; from an infant nation, lately a colony, to a world power.

Alfred Waddell, attempting in his lecture on the Confederate soldier to show the sacrifices of his state in the Civil War, stated that the number of soldiers exceeded the number of voters by six thousand, and that there was a North Carolina unit in every battle of the war, from Bethel to Bentonville. He added that the state's list of killed exceeded that of any other state on either side.¹

Clark Howell at the Peace Jubilee Banquet gave two examples which he said illustrated the spirit which had reunited the country. The first was the burial of a Confederate soldier in Georgia near the close of the war with the inscription: "Here lies a Confederate soldier. He died for his country." The second was when the body of

¹Ibid., p. 278.

his son was shipped home thirty years later from the battle of El Caney, and was buried beneath the inscription: "Here lies the son of a Confederate soldier. He died for his country." Howell likewise traced the developments of the previous six months to prove that the period had been among the most momentous the country had ever seen: the American domain had been extended into the Caribbean on the South and was very near to the Asiatic mainland; the American flag now flew over Puerto Rico, Cuba, and Manila; most important, the conflict had reunited the country against a common enemy.¹

William Gordon McCabe, in working out his Puritan-Cavalier theme, used the following examples of Virginia's stake in the Republic: the first legislative assembly was convened in Virginia; George Mason, a Virginian, drew up the Bill of Rights; Richard Henry Lee first moved in the Continental Congress that the colonies should be independent states; that Thomas Jefferson drafted the Declaration of Independence; that George Washington led the continental forces.²

Analogy and comparison.—A limited attempt was made by at least half of the speakers surveyed to make their arguments more cogent through the use of analogy and comparison. With the exception of Gordon, who employed at least ten recognizable comparisons in his reunion oratory, the other orators utilized this method of reasoning sparingly, most of them using only one or two comparisons per speech. The "Puritan and Cavalier" orators--Grady, Watterson, and McCabe--

¹Reed, op. cit., II, 648.

²Edwin D. Shurter, Oratory of the South (New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1908), p. 21.

necessarily used lengthy comparison in reaching their conclusions about the regional stereotypes. Grady, Watterson, and Gordon, all of whom addressed Boston audiences, supplied long comparisons between conditions in New England and those in the South. Gordon spoke of the great factories, commercial facilities, and developed natural resources of the Northeast, comparing these assets to the water power, minerals, and eager labor force of the South. The future, he said, would see both sections sharing the burden of industrial productivity.¹ Grady chose to contrast the undeveloped and underpopulated South with the bustling, overcrowded Northeast.² Watterson, Waddell, and Pryor, addressing audiences of Union veterans, compared at some length the soldiers who fought for the Union and the Confederacy, concluding that they were all brave and valorous. Waddell proclaimed that the Confederate fought for love of country and constitutional liberty, just as the Federal had done, and that he felt with equal strength his duty to sacrifice his personal interests and defend his beliefs. Waddell also contrasted the returning, victorious Union soldier receiving the acclaim of his country with the ragged, hungry, ex-Confederate who went home unheralded to find his home destroyed and his farm pillaged.³ Grady used almost the identical ideas in his comparison of the discharged soldiers in speaking before the New England Society in 1886.⁴

¹New York Times, April 30, 1878, p. 5.

²Turpin, op. cit., p. 246.

³Waddell, op. cit., pp. 2-6.

⁴Nixon, op. cit., pp. 343f.

Causal relationships.--Several of the speakers attempted to argue by means of causal demonstrations. As noted above under recurrent themes, rather frequent attempts were made to trace the cause of the Civil War to honest differences of interpretation concerning the Constitution. Gordon attempted to show at Cincinnati why the Southern Negro did not vote Republican, and Grady at Boston gave reports of mistreatment of Southern Negroes as the reason for declining Northern immigration to the South. Ben Hill began his Democratic Union speech causally, declaring that in countries where wars were more frequent, experiment had demonstrated that magnanimity in the conqueror was the highest guaranty that the conquered would be submissive. "It is to be regretted," Hill noted, "that you do not seem to have learned this lesson." Later he proclaimed causally: "There can never be any peaceful and cordial reunion possible while one half of the nation regard the other half as criminals." At Cincinnati, Gordon also gave a highly detailed argument as to why the South should love the Union, tracing the history of Southern leadership in the Republic from before its establishment to 1887. Considering the totality of speakers and speeches, causality was a rather frequently used method of demonstration.

Reasoning from authority.--Only a few of the speakers sought confirmation of their own assertions through references to individuals identified by their audiences as possessing knowledge and/or authority on the subject under discussion. At least five of the speakers made reference to Ulysses S. Grant's desire for a return of sectional good feeling. As noted above under recurrent themes, Grant's authority was cited by Gordon at Cincinnati, Wade Hampton at the Chicago monument

dedication, Henry Watterson before the Grant Memorial Association, Henry Grady to the New Englanders, and Thomas Nelson Page at the Brooklyn New England Society.

Grady began his New England Society speech by "quoting" from Ben Hill's 1868 New York address, though the quotation was completely spurious, the words not appearing in any discovered text of Hill's speech, and the date cited by Grady as 1866, being two years in error. Later in the speech, he quoted Daniel Webster as stating before the New England Society forty years before: "Standing hand to hand and clasping hands, we should remain united as we have been for sixty years, citizens of the same country, members of the same government, united, all united now and united forever."¹ Grady was in turn quoted accurately by Henry Watterson, who addressed the New Englanders eleven years later.

During his swing through Ohio, Gordon answered attacks on his policy toward the Negro by quoting Bishop H. M. Turner, an official of the African Methodist Episcopal Church and editor of a Negro newspaper. Other authorities cited included Gen. Horace Binney D'Argent, who according to Joseph Wheeler, had in 1869 predicted reunion of the sections; Sargeant Prentiss, who was quoted by Alfred Waddell as describing the ease of transition from soldier to civilian, and an unidentified English officer whom Waddell stated had testified that the bombardment of Fort Fisher exceeded in intensity that of Sevastapol in the Crimean War.

Probably the relative dearth of argument from authority is

¹New England Society, op. cit., p. 6.

attributable to the same apparent feeling on the part of the speakers that establishment of a strong logical case was generally unnecessary. Only Gordon based a major division of his speech upon authority, in his character defense centered around the statements of Bishop Turner.

Summary.—All the generally-accepted modes of logical proof were employed on one occasion or another by the reconciliation orators in the North, but only two, argument from general proposition and argument from example, were extensively used. While the former technique was fairly well distributed through all the speeches examined, Grady, Hill, Gordon, and Hampton tended to employ examples more frequently than the other orators.

Reasoning from analogy and comparison occurred next in frequency, but was much less frequent than the methods cited above. A few causal arguments are evident, most of them concerning the cause of the of the Civil War. Reasoning from authority was employed sparingly and in only one case was a major division of an argument based upon it.

Ethical Proof

Only slightly more than half of the Southern reunion speakers made what seemed to be deliberate attempts to establish their "intelligence, character, and good will" before the audiences to whom they spoke. Perhaps this is true because, as noted in Chapter II, almost all of them had occupied prominent positions in the Confederate forces. Such was a peculiar, but nonetheless effective ethical endorsement. Many of the ex-soldiers enjoyed national attention because of their political, journalistic, or other activities. Consequently many of them evidently assumed that their prowess was well known to their listeners and

statements designed to enhance their reputation during the speech were not frequently needed. At least thirteen of the speakers, however, did make what appeared to be deliberate attempts to establish ethical proof. Gordon, Grady, Hampton, Herbert, Howell, Lamar, Lee, McCabe, Pryor, Waddell, Watterson, Wheeler, and Young employed praise of their listeners, either direct or indirect, in an evident attempt to achieve a favorable response to their arguments. This was usually attempted through reference to the dignity or reputation of the group address or to the skill represented by the individual members. Grady told the Boston Merchants how delighted he was to come at last to New England, the home of Webster, Longfellow, Emerson, and Channing, and "to make the obeisance that every American owes New England." To the Marshfield Club of Boston, Lamar stated simply, "I am glad to be the guest of men who aim to follow the precepts as taught by the immortal Webster." Hampton spoke glowingly of the Shields Guard and its founder, General James Shields, in presenting the officer with a Mexican battle flag, which, he said, "derives not a little of its luster from his brilliant achievements." G. A. R. assemblies were praised through references to the military accomplishments of the Union army by Watterson, Gordon, Waddell, Hampton, Lee, Pryor, Young, and Wheeler. The New England Society received praise from Grady, McCabe, and Watterson while the latter also lauded the power of the American Bankers.

Examples of vicarious praise of the audience are to be found in Watterson's lecture on Lincoln before the Lincoln Union and his commendation of Grant before the Grant Monument Association and the

Society of the Army of the Tennessee. Hillary Herbert praised his audience indirectly in his eulogy of Grant at a Grant birthday celebration. No one speaker is outstanding for his extensive use of praise as an ethical approach, the examples being fairly well distributed through the speeches of the thirteen speakers cited.

Ethical proof was also presented by the speakers in attributing to themselves worthy motives. The most frequent theme for this purpose, occurring at least twenty-five times, was renunciation of any idea of loyalty to the Confederacy. For example, Grady told the New England Society that the cause for which his father had died was adjudged by an omniscient God to be in error and the curse of human slavery was swept away, together with the threat of destruction which had faced the Union.¹ Hilary Herbert assured his listeners that at no time since the end of the war had even a schoolboy's debating society so much as mentioned the doctrine of secession or made any suggestions concerning the revival of the Confederacy.² Roger Pryor pronounced on Decoration Day, 1877, that "the Northern people now have no cause to mistrust the professions of fealty to the Union that come from the soldiers of the South. Henceforth the strength and security of the South are only to be found under the shield of the Union."³

Nine of the speakers made reference on one or more occasions to service in the Confederate forces, emphasizing either the exploits in which they had been engaged or the privations they had suffered. This,

¹Cincinnati Enquirer, May 31, 1877, p. 2.

²New York Times, April 28, 1894, p. 5.

³Ibid., May 31, 1877, p. 2.

of course, was most frequently done before audiences of veterans. Watterson made a number of references before the Army of the Tennessee to his narrow escapes in combat, stating that it was failure to encounter a bullet, not his absence from the front lines, which had preserved his life.¹ Waddell asked his audience of Union veterans to judge how he and his fellows had fought when "naked and hungry he went-- with lacerated feet but lion heart--from battlefield to battlefield in that stricken land."²

All the thirteen speakers using ethical proof made declarations at least once during the course of each reunion speech as to the unselfishness of their motivation in making the address, usually declaring that the speech was not being made for political purposes but to further the cause of unity. Discussing the race problem before the Boston Merchants, Grady said he was forbidden by the occasion to make a political speech, but that he would proceed "if a purpose to speak in perfect frankness and sincerity, if earnest understanding of the vast interests involved, if a consecrating sense of what disaster may follow further misunderstanding and estrangement" could be counted on to guide his thoughts and words.³ Roger Pryor, making a Memorial Day address in 1877, said that he could consider the invitation only as an overture of reconciliation and the desire for the return of fraternal feeling, and that he would not offend the sensibilities of his

¹Watterson, op. cit., p. 295.

²Waddell, op. cit., p. 6.

³Joel Chandler Harris, Henry W. Grady, His Life, Writings, and Speeches (New York: Cassell Publishing Co., 1890), p. 224.

listeners by making a political speech.¹ Watterson also professed the purity of his motives on Decoration Day at Nashville by saying: "I should not trust myself to speak in this place if I were conscious of any sectional or partisan feeling that may not do honor to a citizen of the United States."² In expressing himself on the productivity of the Southern Negro, Watterson assured his listeners: "I am not here to talk politics, of course."³ As an apparent attempt at ethical proof, both Hampton and Gordon, as governors of Southern states, made references to their accomplishments as administrators.

Summary.--Ethical proof was deliberately employed by a majority of the speakers studied. The most common use was in the renunciation of the ideals of the Confederacy, while references to military or political prowess and to the purity of motivation in delivering the speech were also prevalent.

Emotional Proof

A large number of examples of emotional proof were observed in the speeches studied.

Humor.--The Southern reconciliation speakers made rather extensive use of humor when levity was compatible with the situation. As might be expected, no humor was found in the Decoration Day orations, eulogies, monument dedications, or presentations of battle flags. Furthermore, no apparent attempts at humor occurred in the speeches at political rallies, or in acknowledgements of greetings, where humor might conceivably have been injected. All the evidences of humor were

¹New York Herald, May 31, 1877, p. 2.

²Watterson, op. cit., p. 276.

³Ibid., p. 297.

found in speeches by Gordon, Grady, Lee, McCabe, Waddell, and Watterson. The public lectures of Gordon and Waddell utilized humor, while "after-dinner" situations provided the opportunity for mirth by the others. Humor was presented either in the form of anecdotes, or "jokes," through references to the audience or occasion, or by infrequent plays on words. Perhaps by virtue of the fact that all three of the occasions on which he spoke in the North on reconciliatory themes were "after-dinner" occasions, Henry Grady employed humor most frequently, while Henry Watterson utilized it almost as much.

Grady relied chiefly on the joke, while Watterson employed both the joke and the play upon words. One of Grady's "jokes" before the New England Society involved a man who had been sent into the basement of his house for a pitcher of milk. Returning with his burden, he tripped on the top step and rolled down the stairs. In response to his wife's anxious inquiry as to whether he had broken the pitcher, he replied: "No, I didn't, but I'll be dinged if I don't."¹ In the same speech, he described a preacher who had been victimized by some mischievous boys, so that he read his scripture lesson to the effect that Noah's wife was "140 cubits long, 40 cubits wide, built of gopher wood, and covered with pitch inside and out." Puzzled, he confirmed his reading and then announced that he had never encountered the passage before, but took it as evidence that human beings were "fearfully and wonderfully made."² Illustrating the virtues of the Old South and the New South, he told of a shoeshop with a sign over the

¹Nixon, op. cit., p. 341.

²Ibid.

door reading "John Smith's Shop---Founded in 1760," while across the street Smith's rival announced on his sign "Bill Jones, Established 1886. No old stock kept in this shop."¹ Grady was also willing to lay odds on the Georgian, "as he manufactures relics of the battlefield in a one-story shanty and squeezes pure olive oil out of his cotton seed against any Down-easter that ever swapped wooden nutmegs for flannel sausages in the valleys of Vermont."²

Several examples of Watterson's technique at quips are to be found in his speech to the bankers at Louisville. Here he proclaimed: "A man may quarrel with his wife; he may sometimes venture a suggestion to his mother-in-law; but he must love, honor, and obey his banker." Before the war, he said, "We had our debts and our niggers. Under the old system, we paid our debts and walloped our niggers. Under the new we pay our niggers and wallop our debts."³ One of his anecdotes, employed in the same speech, involved a farmer who called on Robert Toombs at the Milledgeville bank and announced that the people in his section of Georgia were in need of more money and asked Toombs to "stomp" it. "If we do stomp it," Toombs asked, "how are we going to redeem it?" The farmer replied: "The folks down our way are agin redemption."⁴

Like Grady, Fitzhugh Lee used humor chiefly as a "starter" device in the introduction, before developing the serious theme of his

¹Ibid., p. 343.

²Ibid., p. 345.

³Watterson, op. cit., p. 290.

⁴Ibid., p. 292.

speech, while Watterson tended to utilize the humor which grew out of his material, no matter where it occurred in the speech. This latter technique was also used by Gordon and Waddell. In his introduction to the speech before the Philadelphia Hibernian Society, Lee told of Mrs. Washington's efforts to make soap, which met with no success until it was discovered that the materials included ashes of the tree chopped down by son George, and that there was no "lye" in it.¹ In none of the speeches examined did humor furnish anything approximating the total content of the speech. In all cases it was apparently employed for evoking a favorable emotional response from the audience, either preparatory to or in conjunction with the presentation of the intellectual content of the speech.

Scorn and contempt.—Several of the speakers studied strove to evoke as unfavorable emotional response against their enemies, who were in almost every case the individuals allegedly striving to prevent the reunion of the sections. This was attempted through reference to the questionable motives of the Radicals or the undesirability of their methods. Such attempts were made by Gordon, Grady, Hampton, Pryor, Waddell, and Watterson. In no case was the name of any "bloody-shirt" politician specifically mentioned. In his Decoration Day address of 1877, Roger Pryor told his audience that scheming and selfish politicians "might yet cease to obstruct the work of pacification, but soldiers, with a better patriotism and a truer wisdom, know no other policy than conciliation."² Waddell commented concerning the

¹ Reed, op. cit., II, 712.

² Cincinnati Enquirer, May 31, 1877, p. 2.

agitators for disunion: "Now and then, but less and less frequently, demagogues, for sinister purposes, make spasmodic efforts to rekindle the dying embers of our late conflagration, but public sentiment condemns all such efforts, and they will soon cease altogether." Most of them, he said, had not spilled an alarming quantity of blood during the war, and therefore "let them continue to afford us amusement now, as they excited our contempt then. The Union will probably survive if the political career of the wordy warriors does not."¹ Gordon charged that the plummet had never been made which would "sound the depth of infamy" which the disunion politicians reached.² Gordon likewise employed invective at Cincinnati in an apparent attempt to arouse the indignation of his listeners against the "carpetbaggers" in Georgia.

Miscellaneous emotional appeals.—Grady, Gordon, Hill, Howell, and Waddell employed emotionally connotative anecdotes in evident attempts to evoke varied emotional reactions from their listeners. For example, Grady on one occasion described the plight of the footsore Confederate soldier returning from Gettysburg, hungry, dressed in rags, to discover his house in ruins, his farm devastated, his whole economic and social system destroyed. In the midst of all these manifold difficulties, he was faced with the challenge of establishing a status for the freed slaves.³ Before the Boston Merchants, Grady described a visit which he had made to a farmstead

¹Waddell, op. cit., p. 2.

²Cincinnati Enquirer, October 29, 1867, p. 8.

³Nixon, op. cit., p. 344.

in Georgia, where an elderly couple were content and secure in the care of their son and his wife, and as the sun set the children, "singing sweetly down the lane," came bringing home the cows while the birds also sang melodiously in the background. This, Grady said, was the security and tranquility which characterized the "democracy of the South."¹

Both Gordon and Hill related the same war anecdote in which rival armies were encamped on the banks of the Rapidan river and a Union band played "Hail, Columbia" and "Yankee Doodle," both tunes being lustily sung by the Yankees. Then the band played "Dixie" to the accompaniment of Rebel yells, after which it struck up "Home, Sweet Home," and all the men of both armies joined in the singing. Apparently this story was calculated to evoke an emotional acceptance of the idea that the enemies could find a common meeting-ground in their reverence for home and family life, even in the midst of war.²

In addition to emotional stories and anecdotes, another device employed in attempting to evoke emotional responses was the praise of abstract virtues such as integrity, patriotism, bravery, and reverence for honored social institutions. Fitzhugh Lee told the Hibernians that the Confederate forces possessed a high degree of loyalty to their ideals and a willingness to sacrifice for their beliefs. John B. Gordon did virtually the same thing in his speech at Cincinnati and in his "Confederacy" lecture, as did Wade Hampton

¹Harris, op. cit., p. 246.

²Reed, op. cit., III, 484; New York Times, June 7, 1874, p. 10.

in his Chicago speech. Presumably this technique was particularly effective before audiences of veterans whose military experiences had given them respect for loyalty and bravery. Nevertheless, praise of abstract virtues was employed by few of the speakers, and to a limited degree.

Summary.--Emotional proof is evident to a considerable degree in the discovered reconciliation speeches of Southerners in the North. Humor was used freely on suitable occasions and took the form of anecdotes, quips, plays on words, and humorous references to the occasion. A number of speakers attempted to arouse scorn or indignation against their enemies through invidious references to their motives or methods. Anecdotes were employed in apparent attempt to evoke pity, respect, or sympathy toward the groups represented by the speaker. Praise of abstract virtues was employed to a limited degree.

Chapter Summary

Logical, ethical, and emotional proofs were employed rather extensively by Southern reunion orators in the North, though deliberate attempts at ethical proof were employed by a bare majority of the orators. Reasoning from general propositions was the most frequently used method of logical reasoning. Reasoning from example was also employed to a considerable degree, while causal reasoning and reasoning from authority occurred infrequently. When ethical proof was used it was usually relative to the speaker's military or political accomplishments, though indignation against enemies of the speaker was frequently attempted, along with other miscellaneous

ethical appeals. By far the most popular emotional appeal was humor, while emotional anecdotes were employed to evoke pity, respect, or sympathy.

CHAPTER IV

FOUR RECONCILIATION ORATORS

Introduction

The speakers who took part in the Southern reconciliation movement held a variety of positions, from United States Senator and State Governor to obscure lawyers and businessmen. Four of the most prominent men in the movement, in terms of their national reputation and the number of speeches made in the North, were John B. Gordon, Fitzhugh Lee, Wade Hampton, and Henry Watterson. All were ex-Confederates. Lee rose to the rank of brigadier general in the Army of Northern Virginia, and Gordon and Hampton attained the position of lieutenant general in other military units. Watterson, not trained as a military man, served intermittently with the Confederate forces, but gained more publicity for publishing a Rebel newspaper during the war than for his military exploits. When peace was restored, all four distinguished themselves in politics: Gordon, Hampton, and Lee were elected governor of their respective states, while Watterson served as a U. S. Representative in 1876 and wielded considerable influence through his publication of the Louisville Courier-Journal, "a newspaper which was accepted in the North as an oracle of Southern opinion."¹ Thus any of the four

¹Buck, op. cit., p. 186.

were assured a wide—if not necessarily sympathetic—hearing for any utterance in the North.

So far as political views were concerned, all four were conservative Democrats, deploring what they saw as a tendency to convert the South into a Northern colony subject to Northern social and economic ideals. Watterson in particular protested, saying that it seemed to him as though a Yankeedom had appeared in the South, with Southerners striving to outvie one another in acquiring traits which the Old South would have dismissed contemptuously as being associated with a group of shop-keepers.¹ He was likewise contemptuous of the open wooing of Northern capital by such progressives as Henry W. Grady,² though in his editorials and in his speech to the American Bankers Association he was equally outspoken in urging Northerners to invest in the South. In addition to their conservative views concerning the North, all took a position against political and social equality for the Negro, despite Hampton's protestations of "fair play" for colored voters in the Carolina elections of 1878.³ Thus the common background and ideals of these men tended to provide them with somewhat similar approaches to the problems they faced in attempting reconciliation speaking in the North.

Wade Hampton

Inheritor of a famous name from his Revolutionary soldier grandfather, Wade Hampton might be called the epitome of the Cavalier

¹Henry Watterson, "Oddities of Southern Life," Century, XXVII (March, 1883), 895.

²Nixon, op. cit., pp. 250ff.

³Buck, op. cit., p. 111.

planter-soldier-statesman. He was born March 28, 1818, in Charleston, son of one of the largest slaveholders in the South, and spent his early years on "Millwood" plantation near Columbia, where he learned to ride and shoot and developed a love for outdoor life. He also visited his father's extensive landholdings on the Mississippi frontier. Observing the plantation system in operation, he grew to question the economic soundness of the agricultural economy which it produced, but felt that the South was legally entitled to hold slaves. In the 1850's he argued against secession, though he admitted it to be constitutional.

Once committed to the war, he was an energetic leader. He was twice wounded, promoted to lieutenant general and finally to commander of all Confederate cavalry. With the coming of peace he favored President Johnson's reconstruction policy and took sharp issue with Congressional Reconstruction.¹ He was active until 1876 in attempts to overthrow the Republican administration in South Carolina. In that year he defeated Governor Daniel H. Chamberlain and re-established Democratic control in the state. He was reelected governor in 1878 and subsequently served two terms in the U. S. Senate, being defeated in 1890 by a Populist Candidate.²

Hampton was described as possessing a compelling physique, being powerful, broad-shouldered, and deep-chested, and standing at least six feet tall. He wore a full beard.³

¹National Encyclopedia of American Biography (New York: James T. White, 1898), I, 468f.

²Dumas Malone (ed.), Dictionary of American Biography (New York: Scribners, 1932), VIII, 214.

³Manly W. Wellman, Giant in Gray (New York: Scribners, 1949), p. 39.

Audiences and Occasions of Hampton's Reconciliatory Speeches

Hampton first expressed an interest in reconciliatory speaking in his reply to an invitation from John A. McClornand to speak before a rally of the Democrats of Springfield, Illinois, in October, 1868. Hampton wrote as follows:

Your letter . . . has just reached me and I beg to thank you . . . for your polite invitation to address the people of your state. It would give me very great pleasure to accept such a flattering invitation but my services are imperatively demanded here, where we are struggling against great odds, though with a fair degree of success. If I could leave here I would certainly visit the great Northwest, in the hope that I might in some small degree disabuse your people of the false impression given to them by radical misrepresentations of the purposes, the wishes and the desires of the people of the South.¹

With carpetbag rule ended in South Carolina eight years later, however, the newly-elected governor apparently now felt free to travel in the North. He accordingly accepted an invitation for a Northern address. The occasion was an anniversary of the organization of the Shields Guard, a New York National Guard Company, under the command of Gen. James Shields, a pre-war friend of Hampton. The festivities were held in Auburn, New York, on June 21, 1877, with Hampton, Shields, and Governor Robinson of New York as the principal speakers. As one observer described the occasion, "The city was decorated and a very large crowd of people filled the streets along the line of the procession, which was nearly a mile in length. The exercises were held in a grove near the city."² Hampton was introduced by Theodore H. Pomeroy, Republican mayor of Auburn, who commented that "the war is

¹New York Times, October 21, 1868, p. 2.

²New York Herald, June 21, 1877, p. 8.

ended . . . the record is made up and the issues can be retired.¹

Hampton told his audience, more than a thousand persons gathered about the open-air platform, that he was glad to help honor General Shields, then turned to a brief discussion of the political situation in South Carolina. The native whites had just won a victory over unscrupulous carpetbaggers, he said, and now the state was becoming a desirable place to live in for the first time in a number of years. He urged all honest Northern citizens who were interested in settling in South Carolina to do so, and assured them they would be received with the greatest hospitality. He also made assurances that the colored people were being fairly treated and that they had helped to elect him. He urged that the war years be forgotten and that the country look to the future.

Harper's Weekly, feeling out its position as a friend of the South, was enthusiastic in its praise, declaring:

It is a good thing for him to come, and what he said was frank and manly. . . . The point of his speech was its freedom from partisanship where mere partisanship would have been easy. He is entitled to a fair and generous interpretation. . . . There is no honorable citizen, Republican or Democrat, who cannot cordially cry amen to his utterances. Every reader will see that this is no ordinary party oratory.²

The New York Times, usually generous in its reviews of such activities, could not have taken a more opposite view. Describing his allusions to life in South Carolina as a "beautiful vision," the Times denied that all was tranquility in that state and declared that "Mr.

¹Wellman, op. cit., p. 297f.

²"Wade Hampton's Visit," XXI (July 7, 1877), 519.

Hampton's Vision . . . can be received only in a dim, prophetic sense, with which the stern present unpleasantly conflicts." Attempting further to belittle the significance of his visit, the Times commented: "He made a speech celebrating the glory of Gen. Shields in a neat autobiography of Wade Hampton, and a soul-stirring account of Wade Hampton's trials and triumphs in South Carolina. . . ."¹

Hampton's second reconciliatory speech came later in the same year. In August, 1875, the Winnebago County Agricultural Society of Rockford, Illinois, had evoked a storm of controversy by attempting to secure the services of Jefferson Davis as principal speaker for their annual fair.² Rebuffed by public opinion, but still determined to hear a Southerner on their home ground, the directors extended the invitation in 1877 to Hampton, who accepted with alacrity and appeared at the exposition on September 14. He was escorted to the grounds by two National Guard Companies, the Rockford Rifles and the Aurora Light Guards, and accompanied to the speakers' stand by a "large number of prominent citizens," including Congressman William Lathrop, who introduced him. An estimated 10,000 people were on the grounds, though according to one report it was doubtful whether all were able to hear the speech delivered from the open-air platform.³ No other comments about delivery are available.

To what was predominantly a rural audience, Hampton remarked that he knew little about farming in Illinois and so would be forced

¹June 22, 1877, p. 4.

²Duluth Minnestoan, September 6, 1875, p. 3.

³Chicago Tribune, September 14, 1877, p. 1.

to discuss conditions in the South. The war and reconstruction had resulted in wasted industries and political misrule, he stated, but the residents were reconciled to defeat and had set to work to rebuild their area. He had come, despite threatening letters, to plead for peace, and would carry to South Carolina the warmth of his welcome in Rockford.¹

The Chicago Tribune marked the Rockford appearance as a milestone in reconciliation, prefacing its comments with a masterpiece of understatement:

We are not disposed to gush, nor to regard all the perplexing problems growing out of the war and reconstruction as definitely and satisfactorily settled; but we find in the event to which we refer the promise and evidence of good feeling which warrants a confidence that all these questions will be settled, and that there will be the peaceful and fraternal relations between the people of the North and South which are necessary to the political welfare and commercial prosperity of the whole country. We certainly approve of Gen. Hampton's Rockford address, not merely as a brilliant piece of oratory, but as being well-considered, in good taste, and the right temper. . . . Many others, nearer home, could have talked entertainingly, and perhaps instructively, about farm topics, but there was none other in a position to speak with more authority or more fairly to represent the Southern view in discussing the relations between the North and the South. No impartial person who has read his address can deny that he walked over this dangerous ground in a manly fashion. His address was nowhere tinged with partisanship, nor did he show the slightest rancor either against his former enemies . . . nor the late enemies who helped to plunder his state after the war. . . .

It would be well if there could be more frequent interchange of sentiment between the North and the South after the manner secured through Wade Hamilton's [sic] appearance at Rockford. A good deal of mistaken rancor would thus be wiped out. . . .²

In contrast with his Auburn speech of four months earlier, no other

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., September 15, 1877, p. 4.

national publication chose to comment upon the Rockford speech.

Hampton's last appearance as a reunion speaker marked the climax of his expression of reunion sentiment, because the occasion itself was noteworthy as a measure of the extent to which reconciliatory feeling had grown. On May 30, 1895, Hampton came to Chicago to dedicate a monument to six hundred Confederates who had died in Chicago prisons during the war. A noteworthy fact about this monument was that funds for its construction were chiefly subscribed by ex-Union soldiers. Both Grand Army men and Confederate veterans participated prominently in the dedication ceremony. The Chicago City Troop of the National Guard escorted Hampton and his party, including Generals James Longstreet and Fitzhugh Lee, from the railway station to a downtown hotel. At the monument site in Oakwood cemetery, bordering Lake Michigan, General John C. Underwood, originator of the memorial idea, sketched the development of the monument. In addition to Hampton's major address, other activities included a memorial ode by Henry T. Stanton of Kentucky and the spiking of four Union cannon which were captured by the Confederates at Murphreesboro and used by them throughout the war. The monument was then decorated with wreaths, the field was cleared, and taps were blown.¹

Such an event, Hampton told the audience, could occur nowhere but in America. Southerners had long decorated the graves of fallen Union heroes, and now the Northerners had offered a fitting counterpart of this act. He knew that any criticism of the monument would not come from brave men and true soldiers, but from petty politicians and men

¹New York Times, May 31, 1895, p. 2.

of little vision. Had the field generals, Lee and Grant, been left to make all peace terms, little animosity would have survived the end of the fighting. Lincoln had been the South's greatest friend, Hampton asserted, and his death was a terrible tragedy to the region. Returning to the subject at hand, Hampton said that the monument would be the symbol of North-South unity throughout the ages.¹ Occurring as it did, thirty years after the war's end in a highly emotionalized setting at the scene of an overt act of reunion by Northerners, the speech could hardly have been given in a more ideal environment. One writer sanguinely pronounced the dedication to be the disappearance of all sectional differences:

Financially and socially the historic "Mason and Dixon's Line" has been obliterated from the map of the United States and in the leading features of Memorial Day ceremonies here today, it would seem that politically as well, the "dead line" between the slave and free territory has been thrown down.

With the dedication today in this, one of the staunchest of the Union cities, of a handsome monument to the memory of the men who wore the gray and fought for the "lost cause" a Confederate "high water mark" was established far North of that set at Gettysburg by force of arms. . . .

It is the first monument to the Confederate dead erected in the North. It does not appear that anywhere on the face of the round globe, within a period of thirty years after the close of a bitterly contested war, the vanquished have ever before erected a monument to the memory of their comrades in arms in the heart of the victor's territory, especially with the victors heartily joining the vanquished in doing honor to the vanquished dead.²

With this background concerning the occasions and delivery of the speeches, an analysis of the arrangement, modes of proof, and style will be undertaken.

¹Chicago Tribune, May 31, 1895, p. 2.

²St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 30, 1895, p. 1.

Analysis of Hampton's Reconciliation Speeches

Of the three reunion speeches delivered in the North by Wade Hampton, two were made in 1877, near the beginning of the reconciliatory speaking movement, and the third in 1895, near its close. The last address, a dedication of a monument to Confederate dead, was narrower in scope and more closely oriented around the occasion than were the earlier ones, possibly because the exigencies of party politics were less demanding in 1895 than in 1877 and the practical necessities of reconciliation less acute. Consequently the 1895 address omitted many of the ideas expressed in 1877. Of the earlier speeches, the one at the Winnebago County Fair, Rockford, Illinois, reveals most about Hampton's speaking techniques in his reconciliatory attempts. It contains all the ideas expressed in the three speeches, and the ideas are more fully developed than at the Shields Guard Celebration in Auburn, New York, earlier the same year.

In the introduction to the speech, Hampton stated that he had traveled more than a thousand miles to be present and to express his appreciation to the society for its strong reconciliatory feeling.¹ He pledged his cooperation in any reunion undertaking which it might plan in the future. Virginia contributed her Western domain to the development of the Union, he reminded his listeners, and part of the territory became Illinois; the state must therefore be strong and patriotic in order to be worthy of its heritage.

Moving into the body of the speech, Hampton coyly commented

¹This was an obvious reference to the invitation which the society had extended to Jefferson Davis to address the Winnebago Fair in 1875. Probably it also referred to the invitation which Hampton received from the society in 1868.

that if he understood the nature of his invitation, it was to discuss matters other than agriculture. He stated his apparent theme in the speech, that much of the misunderstanding between the sections had come from poor knowledge of mutual motives, and that closer acquaintance could clear up many of these difficulties. He promised to base his appeals upon national rather than party considerations.

The next major point of the speech concerned the causes of the war. Hampton laid the conflict squarely upon a misinterpretation of the Constitution in which both sections were equally convinced of the rightness of their stands. Moving on to postwar developments, he stated that a vindictive reaction on the part of the victors was only natural, as bitterness came easily to the vanquished, but that the time had come when these sentiments should be forgotten. The speaker now returned to the war, discussing his actions in regard to it. Until its outbreak, he said, he had used every possible means of preserving the Union. When his state called him, he had fought as long and as hard as possible, had surrendered in good faith at Appomattox, and had kept the terms of his parole.

Hampton now switched rather abruptly to prevailing conditions in the South, which he described as an area of wasted fields and ruined industries, under a shocking political misrule resulting from reconstruction. The reaction of Southerners to this situation, he stated, was highly commendable. South Carolina had remained calm during the Hayes-Tilden controversy. In Congress, Southern leaders had forestalled a filibuster on the disputed election issue, as admitted even by radical Northern newspapers. Even in recent labor riots in the North, the strikers had not been joined by the docile,

Southern laborers. Before moving on, the speaker supplied an internal summary involving the good faith of the South in surrendering, the failure of Southerners to riot or filibuster during the disputed election, and the failure of Southern labor to strike.

Hampton now dutifully inserted a section on agriculture, saying that the ~~citizens~~ would profit little from advice on how to raise cotton, sweet potatoes, or prindles, but that the state of Illinois was incredibly fertile. He broached the subject of Negro suffrage, saying that it was achievable only through education of the hearts and minds of men, but did not develop the matter further. The conclusion of the speech included a plea for the North to aid the South in her recovery and a promise of cooperation and brotherhood in return.¹

Aside from references to the occasion, the major difference in the content of this speech from Hampton's earlier effort at Auburn was its catholicity of approach. The Auburn speech contained a lengthier reference to local conditions in South Carolina and what Wade Hampton had done about them, as contrasted with his effort at Winnebago to serve as the spokesman of the entire area in explaining the background and aftermath of the war and the existing problems and opportunities of the South.

Arrangement

All three of Hampton's discovered reunion speeches begin with somewhat lengthy references to the audience and occasion. At Auburn, he stated that his purpose in coming was only to pay homage to his

¹Chicago Tribune, September 14, 1877, p. 5.

friend, General Shields, and to return a battle flag which the General had carried in the Mexican War. After discussing the bravery of Shields and his troops, Hampton alluded to recent political developments in South Carolina and launched into a discussion of carpetbagging and the treatment of the Negro. Only at his appearance in Chicago did he discuss throughout the speech his declared theme on the meaning and significance of the monument being dedicated. This speech was rather carefully organized, with a discussion of the conditions giving rise to the construction of the monument, an analysis of the symbolism involved in Memorial Day celebrations, a brief digression concerning the great leaders in the conflict, and in conclusion a return to the monument as the symbol of North-South reunion.

Arrangement of the Winnebago Fair speech is not so compact. The major divisions of the body are: (1) Misunderstanding has come from lack of acquaintance and familiarity; (2) The War resulted from a misinterpretation of the Constitution; (3) Hampton played a major role in war and peace; (4) Conditions in the South are deplorable; (5) The Hayes-Tilden election proved the stability of the South; (6) Illinois agriculture is unexcelled. Within this rather disjointed structure are some awkward digressions on minor points. Transitions in the Winnebago speech are not so effective or so carefully worked out as in either of the other speeches. Types of proof do not occur according to any consistent pattern throughout the speeches.

All of the speeches, in summary, may be said to possess an introduction and a conclusion which contain a reference to the occasion,

and a body in which one or two of these are stated, followed by a narration in support of the main ideas. Supporting material within the body of the speech follows no evident pattern. One of the speeches adheres closely to a stated theme; the other two are marked by digressions uncoordinated with the central idea.

Modes of Proof

Logical proof

Hampton made use of a variety of logical elements in his reconciliation speaking, as is illustrated in his Rockford address, though he did not employ authority in any of his addresses on reunion themes. Principal logical techniques were causal arguments, reasoning from general propositions.

Causal Reasoning.—Hampton began his speech at Rockford by explaining in some detail why he had taken the time and trouble to travel to Illinois, a distance of a thousand miles, to attend the fair. First, he said, he was honored at the invitation and wished to meet the people of Illinois. Second and more important, the Winnebago association had been instrumental in inaugurating a spirit of reconciliation and Hampton felt impelled to thank them for it. Third, he wished personally to pledge his support to any future efforts they might make concerning reconciliation. His thesis was a causal assertion phrased as follows: "It is of the greatest consequence that the people of the North and of the South should understand each other thoroughly, for much of the evil that has fallen on the country sprang from misconception on the part of the citizens of these sections as to the motives and purposes of each other." Hampton attributed the misunderstanding between the sections since the war to a poor appreciation

of motives. He traced the cause of the war to diametrically opposed interpretations of the Constitution. Then he described what he believed to be the natural consequences of the war, a vindictive spirit on the part of the victors and bitterness and frustration by the losers. Next he stressed why the South was seeking good feeling, pointing to her depleted agriculture, ruined industries and destroyed cities, and her "fearful" political misrule. His Auburn speech suggested that humility was the key to national success. When the people are willing to seek God's help, he said, "We may look forward to a time of peace, prosperity, and happiness."

Reasoning from example.---In attempting to establish that the South was unquestionably sincere, Hampton reasoned from an example drawn from the recent political scene. He described in detail the events surrounding the disputed Hayes-Tilden election, when he said that a single riot would have touched off another civil conflict. The South nevertheless waited calmly for the verdict, he stated, indicating by her passivity that she was willing to accept a legal adjudication of the matter. The utilization of one example was typical of Hampton's reasoning. He never sought to build a heavy weight of examples in arguing inductively, and the technique itself appears sparingly in his reunion speeches.

Reasoning from general propositions.---In dealing with the issue of universal suffrage, Hampton preferred to use a number of general propositions rather than discussing the matter in detail. For example, in discussing North-South animosities at Auburn, he announced:

The question can only be solved by the education of the heart and soul, as well as of the mind. When we have succeeded.

in that, we must make a man believe that all learning is foolishness in the sight of the Lord, and we must look to God for help.

In his Chicago speech the orator relied rather heavily on general propositions, though he used them somewhat less at Auburn. At Chicago, for example, he stated: "The scene presented here today is one that could not be witnessed in any country but our own." From this he inferred that the Americans possessed a unique capacity to forgive their enemies not to be found in the people of any other nationality. Later he referred to the monument and commented: "As long as this lofty column points to Heaven; as long as one stone of its foundation remains, future generations of Americans should look upon it with pride." His inferred but unstated assumption here was that the joint construction of the memorial by North and South was an act deserving of universal and lasting reverence. Hampton attacked the critics of the monument's erection by stating: "If the humane, generous action of the people of this city in doing honor to the memory of their old antagonists is denounced as desecration, it would seem to follow that the decoration of Federal graves by 'rebel' hands should lie open to the same criticism." Hampton took this means of establishing the proposition that mutual demonstrations of respect by ex-Confederates and ex-Rebels were equally laudable. Establishing the concept that any attempt to discredit the monument was the act of a coward, he noted: Such narrow and bigoted feelings as would prompt a discordant note on occasions of this sort are rarely found among true men and brave soldiers." The establishing of general propositions such as those just cited as a basis for deductive judgment of specific instances was apparently safer than attempting to argue inductively from

specific instances. This was especially true when the speakers were dealing with such matters as treatment of the Negro and attempts to revive Rebel sentiment.

Summary.---Hampton relied rather heavily upon causal reasoning and reasoning from general propositions in his reunion speaking, employing other types of logical proof much less frequently. Though his speech at Auburn was heavily criticized by the New York Times, he did not attempt to forestall future attacks or offer direct refutation to his accusers by including refutative material in subsequent speeches.

Ethical proof

At Rockford, Hampton used the ethical theme of his role in the war:

I make no concealment of the part taken by myself in the late War, nor would your respect for me be increased were I to offer any unmanly apology. Up to the beginning of the contest I used all my influence to preserve the Union, to avoid the War; but, when that came, I obeyed the command of my state as you did yours, and I fought you as long and as hard as I could. But when I surrendered I did so in good faith, and from that day to this I challenge anyone to show that the terms of my parole have been violated, or that any act of mine has been inconsistent with my honor as a soldier and my duty as a citizen.¹

Somewhat later in the speech he returned to virtually the same ethical theme:

I want to impress upon you this fact, that I challenge any man living to say that from that day to this I have violated in any degree my oath. I pledged myself then to support the Constitution of the United States and all its amendments, and when I took the official oath as Governor of South Carolina, I swore to uphold it, and so help me God, I intend to keep it.²

¹Chicago Tribune, September 14, 1877, p. 1.

²Ibid.

Hampton now attempted to impress his audience with his personal bravery and disregard for danger by reading a threatening letter which he said he had received, promising his death if he appeared in Rockford. If anything could make him wish to come, he said, this was it.

At Auburn, he used even more ethical appeals. Since this speech was delivered, like that at Rockford, a scant twelve years after the end of the war, it is not surprising that there were ethical connotations to many of his statements. He proclaimed that his only motive in visiting New York was the return of a battle flag. As a part of his speech concerning conditions in South Carolina, however, he described himself as the leader in an effort to rid the state of corrupt carpetbag rule. Stating that the effort against the carpetbaggers had been more than a party struggle, Hampton announced: "It ranged far higher than any such contest ever waged on this continent." In urging Northerners to migrate to the South, the governor personally pledged them a hospitable reception on behalf of the state, an obvious indication of his authority and prestige in South Carolina. Hampton consistently used "we" in describing how the Carolinians had selected a Republican as state supreme court justice. At one point he stated: "We wanted to show you people of the North that we were actuated by the highest and most patriotic feeling." Turning to racial matters, Hampton again focused attention on himself:

I declared that if elected I would be Governor of the whole people of South Carolina; that I should know no race, no party, no color; that all men who stood on the soil of South Carolina, native or foreign born, white or black, should be equal under the law, and so help me God it shall be done.
 . . . I owe my election to the Colored men of South Carolina.

Thousands of them voted for me, knowing that I have been a good friend of their race, knowing that I was the first man after the war to recommend that they should be given the right of suffrage. . . .¹

By contrast to this lengthy ethical argument at Auburn, Hampton made no personal references whatever at Chicago eighteen years later, when changing conditions had made the motives and actions of Southern leaders far less suspect.

Another ethical technique which Hampton employed extensively was praise of his audience. At Rockford he discussed favorably the warmth and hospitality of the agricultural association, and complimented the members on their vision and patriotism in inaugurating and continuing a program directed toward reconciliation. He lavished praise on Illinois agriculture, saying that he had never seen such remarkable products and that the size and fertility of Illinois was sufficient to feed the entire nation of Great Britain. The speaker was also generous in his praise at Auburn and at Chicago, referring in the latter speech not only to the warmth of his reception, but to the generosity of the Chicagoans who had erected the monument he was dedicating. To summarize the speaker's use of ethical proof, he based his extensive use of ethical appeals on his political accomplishments, the professed purity of his motives, and praise of his audience.

Emotional proof

In describing at Auburn the Democratic struggle against the carpetbaggers in South Carolina, Hampton resorted to the "dramatic trio," a device described by social psychologist Richard Lapiere,²

¹Ibid.

²Richard T. Lapiere, Collective Behavior (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938), p. 138.

casting himself as hero, the unwelcome Northern visitors as villains, and law, order, honesty, and similar abstract virtues as heroine. By this means he hoped to arouse scorn and contempt against the carpet-baggers and sympathy for the abused South. In the Chicago speech he attempted in a similar manner to arouse indignation against those who might criticize the erection of such monuments as the one being dedicated. "Such narrow and bigoted feelings as would prompt a discordant note on occasions of this sort," he said, "are rarely found among true men and brave soldiers." Hampton likewise shed a few rhetorical tears at the death of Lincoln, commenting: "It was a cruel fate that deprived him of what he hoped would be the reward of his labors, and the South of one who would have been her strongest protector in her sorest hour of need." He likewise strove to create a feeling of pity for the soldiers who had died in the war, describing the "thousands, hundreds of thousands," of who were "sleeping in bloody graves."

At Rockford, Hampton attempted to promote sympathy for the South in the wake of war and reconstruction. He described her "wasted fields," her "ruined industries," and the burden of political misrule which were the heritage of war. He appealed to the appreciation of his audience for such qualities as sincerity and integrity by proclaiming that the South was "rash, impulsive, impetuous, but never false to her principles." It may be said in summary that Hampton used emotional proof to forestall criticism of his actions and to arouse sympathy for causes with which he identified himself.

Style

Lou Sarett and William T. Foster have provided a series of four

criteria concerning style which will be applied to the speeches of Hampton, as well as to those of Gordon, Lee, and Watterson.¹ The first criterion, accuracy, concerns the use of specific and general terminology. Such words as "tree" or "bird" are considered as general terms, while related specific words are "pine tree" and "bluebird." Likewise the verb forms of "to go" are very general, while "creep," "spring," or "saunter" have such more exact associations. Thus the speeches will be examined to determine in what proportion the speakers employed general terms, as contrasted with their use of specific words having colorful associations. The second criterion, force, encompasses the ideas of economy and sentence structure. Economy includes a description of word and sentence length and evaluation of redundancy of word usage. Sentence structure involves the use of antithesis, parallel construction, and the like. The third criterion, ease, refers to appropriate informality and direct address in language. The final standard, suggestiveness, denotes imagery and descriptiveness in word usage. With this framework as a point of departure, an attempt will be made to draw conclusions about the word usage of Wade Hampton in his reconciliation speeches.

Accuracy

At Rockford, as elsewhere, Hampton rather consistently chose general terms when he might have gained a more exact effect through the use of specific language. He addressed his audience as "fellow-citizens" of "Illinois," rather than of "Central Illinois" or "Winnebago County," which might have supplied the majority of his

¹Basic Principles of Speech (Cambridge: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1946), pp. 558-63.

listeners with a closer feeling of association. Columbia, South Carolina, was referred to as "my distant home." In describing the war, he used as an example of bravery and devotion a "Bayard,"¹ a name which may not have had as much association with his audience as a "Grant" or "Stonewall Jackson." It is true, he said, that "our people" should learn a lesson from the manner in which Nature works to repair the damage of a destructive storm, but the context of the idea leaves unclear whether he meant the Northern people, the Southern people, or all Americans. The pitiful condition of the South was described in terms of "wasted fields, ruined industries, and fearful misrule," with no attempt to elaborate upon how the fields were wasted, how the industries were destroyed, or what was the nature of the political mismanagement. Hampton spoke of criticism from "the violent newspapers of the North." In discussing the election commission report on the Hayes-Tilden election, he said that its acceptance in the South had been endorsed by ex-Rebel Congressmen, whom he referred to only as "those men." The speaker asked for protection of the Constitution for South Carolina and Massachusetts alike, but did not say to what articles of the Constitution he was referring. Similarly, in dedicating the Confederate monument at Chicago, Hampton spoke of "the brave and liberal men of Chicago" who had erected the monument, rather than of John C. Underwood, who was credited with originating the idea, and of the members of the Columbia G. A. R. post who conducted the fund-raising campaign. He mentioned "the two great captains" who engaged in the struggle at Appomattox, failing to mention the magic

¹Chevalier de Pierre du Terrail Bayard (1473-1523) was a famous French knight, said to be "without fear and above reproach."

names of Grant and Lee. On a few occasions Hampton did use specific terminology when it might have been avoided, as in referring to the Winnebago Agricultural Society when he might have said "this organization," and in naming Virginia as "the mother of your state," but for the most part he employed little concrete language.

Force

A sampling of words from the Rockford speech reveals a preponderance of words of three and four syllables, some of which may have presented a challenge to the understanding of Hampton's audience, composed as it was of rural people of mixed sexes and all ages. While Hampton's vocabulary included words which were doubtless well-known to the educated men of his time, some of them may have been lost on the audience just described. A few of these apparently obscure words were "infinite," "beneficient," "obligatory," "cordial," "dominions," "aggrandizement," "ancestry," "salutary," "proprieties," "immutable," "verdure," and the like. Some of these words, which Hampton did not define or otherwise clarify through context, may have presented a barrier to the forcefulness of his style and to the intelligibility of his ideas. On the other hand, they may have impressed his more unsophisticated audiences, such as that at Rockford.

The speaker frequently employed sentences of moderate length, most of them either simple or compound in construction. The average sentence length in the Rockford speech is in the neighborhood of thirty words, with his introductory sentence the longest of the speech, running to eighty-one words. Few sentences are of a complex or compound-complex construction and few contain parenthetical expressions. The

combination of relatively "difficult" words with sentences of medium length, however, probably combined to make the Rockford speech a challenging one to comprehend. Witness the following sentences:

The Mother of your state, Virginia, when she gave this grand Western domain--an empire in its dominions--to the common cause, did so because she preferred the good of the whole country to her individual aggrandizement, and you would be unworthy of the historic lineage you possess were you to forget your glorious ancestry and the lesson it should perpetually teach you.

Time brings reflection and calm thought to aid in the work of restoration, whilst God himself, speaking to us through the immutable laws of Nature, tells us that it is our duty to strive earnestly and constantly to efface the dark blots which evil or disaster may have made.

Such constructions as these probably detracted from the forcefulness of Hampton's style, as did his occasional redundancy and use of qualifying words and expressions. Lauding the Winnebago Society's leadership in reconciliation, he described it as "if not the first, certainly among the first of organizations" to encourage reunion. He regarded his visit as "not only a pleasure, but a duty." Few nouns were allowed to pass unmodified. He spoke of his "far distant" home, "heartly" cooperation, "manly and patriotic" efforts, "noble" patriotism, "purely agricultural" subjects, "vital" issues, "great" state, "dread" ordeal, "fearful" misrule, and "official" oath, to cite a few examples. All the factors considered under the heading of economy indicate that Hampton's style was somewhat prolix.

Several examples of anthethesis are to be found in Hampton's reunion speeches. At Rockford he declared: "To aid in bringing about this understanding is one of the chief objects of my visit, and to this end it is that I choose general topics rather than those belonging specially to agriculture, but in doing this you need have no fears that

I shall violate the proprieties of the occasion by making a political speech." Later he employed both antithesis and parallel construction in stating: "I speak for no party, no section, but for the whole country." He stated in parallel relation: "You of the North followed the dictates of your own conscience. We of the South did the same." He then demanded: "Can you doubt that the South seeks peace? Do you doubt her sincerity?" It may be said of Hampton's employment of these stylistic devices that he made moderate use of them, though he did not utilize them on every possible occasion.

Suggestiveness

Some of the language employed by Hampton in personifying Time and Nature probably evoked an emotional reaction in his listeners. Time, he said, brings "reflection and calm thought to aid in the work of restoration, whilst God Himself, speaking to us through the immutable laws of Nature, tells us that it is our duty to strive earnestly and constantly to efface the dark blots which evil or disaster may have made." He also described Nature as "the beneficent mother," who "with gentle hands, clothes hillsides and valley with her perpetual verdure and her smiling flowers." In his Chicago speech are also such suggestive words and phrases as "bloody graves," "bloody chasm," "notable examples of courage and devotion," "this lofty column which points to Heaven," "humble private soldiers," "gray-headed Confederate veterans," "untimely death," and "cruel fate." It may be said in general that Hampton made rather extensive use of suggestive and connotative words.

Personification was a favorite device of Hampton in his reunion speaking. He personified Time, Nature, Fate, the South, and the nation.

Analogy was employed on a few occasions, as in the likening of a flood to the destruction of war, and Nature's attempts to repair the damage to the efforts of generous and patriotic men to reunite the combatants. In general, however, the speeches are lacking in figures of speech. In summary, Hampton achieved a considerable suggestiveness of style by employing connotative phrases and personification. His speeches generally lack figures and humorous references.

Ease

In the available texts of Hampton's speeches are to be found no contractions. Possibly contractions were not considered an acceptable form for the nineteenth century platform, or perhaps they were removed by reporters or editors. Neither were any words discovered which might be classed as slang, except in the quoted phrase, "you darned old Rebel." The idiomatic term "carpet-bagger" appears a number of times in Hampton's Auburn speech. All the speeches abound in examples of direct address. "Fellow-citizens" formed a part of the salutation of all three speeches. Other examples of direct address were "my friends," "you people of the North," "you men of New York," "gentlemen of the Society," and "brave men of Chicago." The most frequently used of these phrases were "my friends," and "fellow-citizens," though the simple pronoun "you" occurred frequently. It may be said in summary that Hampton relied heavily upon direct address for stylistic ease.

Summary

Hampton's speaking style in reunion messages was characterized by a general lack of specific language. Rather "obscure" words were employed in sentences of moderate length, and there was some tendency

to over-modification of nouns. He employed antithesis sparingly. A number of connotative words were utilized, but little use was made of figures of speech.

Fitzhugh Lee

From the same background and tradition as Wade Hampton came Fitzhugh Lee. Born in Fairfax County, Virginia, Lee received a sound classical education before attending the Military Academy at West Point. As an Indian fighter on the Texas frontier, he learned practical lessons about the deployment of troops and the effective use of cavalry. It is not, therefore, surprising that he was made a brigadier general in the Army of Northern Virginia and came to be recognized as one of a dozen outstanding American cavalry officers. Following the war, he turned his attention to Southern history and inaugurated, largely with his own funds, the publication of the Southern Historical Society Papers, which he edited for about 20 years. He established a reputation as an historical lecturer. He also played a prominent part in Cuban affairs, serving from 1886 to 1890 as United States Consul General to Havana and 1898 being commissioned Major General in the United States Army. He was charged with restoring order in Cuba following the fall of Santiago. Like Hampton, Lee was an admirable horseman and naturalist. Heavily built and broad-shouldered, he wore a full beard during most of his adult life.¹

Audiences and Occasions of Lee's Reunion Speaking

Not being actively associated with national politics before

¹Malone, op. cit., VIII, 294.

1880 and living in a state less troubled with the violence which accompanied reconstruction in many states further South, Lee did not bear the stigma under which such men as Hampton, John B. Gordon, and Lucius Lamar struggled in the North. Northerners tended to accept him as a brilliant and dashing military figure who had fought under the Stars and Stripes and had unfortunately chosen the wrong side in the sectional quarrel, rather than as a political enemy intent on destroying the fruits of Union victory. Probably for this reason he was chosen by the Centennial Committee of the Battle of Bunker Hill to be the symbol of Southern spirit. The climate surrounding his appearance and speech could hardly have been more favorable. Hundreds of ex-Confederates, including the Washington Light Infantry of Charleston and the Norfolk Blues, two aristocratic state guard units, paraded through the streets to the Bunker Hill monument and engaged in countless acts of friendliness with the local citizens.¹ The Southerners were welcomed by John Quincy Adams II, who charged them:

Gentlemen, you are come here to march up in the procession tomorrow to Bunker Hill, there in that sacred ground once for all to bury any ill-blood and misunderstanding which may have existed between us. In such a place and at such a time you can do no better work. You are come so that once more we may pledge ourselves to a new union; not to a union merely of the law or simply of the lips. . . . Knowing that you come with that feeling in your hearts, with that word of reconciliation inscribed on your banners, you are peculiarly welcome.²

Lee could hardly have been termed the principal orator of the celebration. His chief function apparently was to serve as the symbol

¹ Samuel Norton and M. A. Devitt Howe (eds.), Letters of Charles Elliot Norton (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1913), II, 55f.

² New York Times, June 17, 1875, p. 1.

of Southern loyalty as he was paraded through the streets of Boston in an open carriage, but at the reception tendered him in Boston Music Hall on June 17, he had the opportunity for one speech. Because of the emotionality and enthusiasm of the occasion, it is not surprising that all accounts of this brief speech were enthusiastic. Indeed, he said little which might have proved offensive, expressing his surprise and delight at the warmth of welcome extended to the Southerners. He interpreted this as the return of good feeling and promised to convey the spirit back to Virginia. Northern writers chortled delightedly at the effect which Lee and the Southerners had carried home with them, and his speech in Norfolk following his return home was quoted in part by Harper's Weekly and the New York Times:

Do you know what all this means? It means at that end of the line precisely what the outpouring of you people at this end of the line to meet us means, viz., that the people of this country have taken this matter of reconstruction out of the hands of the politicians; that the crust which separated them has been broken at last, and the men of the North and South are at last allowed to see each other face to face.¹

In 1882, Lee rejected an invitation which could have provided him with another opportunity for reconciliatory speaking. He received an invitation from August Hamlin of the Bangor, Maine, Grand Army Post which read as follows:

I am instructed by the Grand Army Post, Number 12 of this city, which numbers among its members about 350 old soldiers, to invite you to deliver before them and the citizens of Bangor your lecture on the battle of Chancellorsville, which I understand you are now delivering in southern cities for the benefit of the Southern Historical Society.

We shall be pleased to listen to your description of the battle and we shall be prepared to accept its truth; for the deeds of valor performed on either side during the war have

¹New York Times, June 25, 1875, p. 2.

new become the property of the nation. . . .

The invitation extended to you is offered in good faith, and has no ulterior motive whatever. You will not be expected to arrange your lecture to suit our fancies, but to say whatever you think is right and proper.

If the proposition is acceptable to you, I think we can make arrangements for you to deliver the same lecture on your return trip homeward at Portland, Providence, and perhaps at other cities in New England.

I think the old soldiers of the Grand Army would be very glad to lend their assistance in aiding you to obtain funds for the use of the Southern Historical Society; for the truth must prevail in the end.¹

The invitation was significant for its assurance of a fair hearing for what Lee had to say, and probably reflects the respect in which he was held by all soldiers, whether Union or Confederate.

The following year he did accept an invitation to visit New York as the guest of the Thirteenth Regiment, New York National Guard. The bid to the elaborate two-day affair came as the result of friendships which Lee and his party had made during their Centennial trip to New England. On February 7, a concert, batallion drill, review, and dress parade were given in Lee's honor at the Flatbush Armory. Following the dress parade, Lee was introduced and made a speech. He expressed his pleasure at the widespread manifestations of reunion sentiment, said he realized that slavery and secession had not been the wise course of action, and pledged that Virginia's only ambition was to rival New York as "the brightest jewel in the Union Coronet."

On the following night Lee and his party were entertained at a banquet at the Mansion House in Brooklyn Heights, where he once again had the opportunity for a public speech. The dining hall was hung with flags and the state insignia of Virginia was prominently displayed.

¹Fitzhugh Lee (ed.), Southern Historical Society Papers, XI (Richmond: Southern Historical Society, 1884), 43f.

About 200 guests were seated at five long tables. Col. J. F. Austen proposed the toast "Our Guests and Virginia," to which he called for Lee to respond. Lee's rising was received by three cheers and the inevitable "tiger," and the band played "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia's Shore."¹ In his speech, Lee dwelt mostly on the growing spirit of nationalism, maintaining that sectional barriers were gradually disappearing with the growing spirit of reconciliation. He then discussed the potentialities of Virginia and all the South, and asked the help of Northern men and capital in developing the region's resources.²

Four years elapsed before Lee's next conciliatory speech in the North. He appeared before a partisan Democratic crowd at Tammany Hall as the main orator of the organization's annual Fourth of July celebration in 1887. He discussed at length the composition and ratification of the Constitution and quoted John Randolph as maintaining that the document had a fatal flaw in the failure to define states' rights more adequately. The war had cut out this "poison under the wing of the American eagle" and there was no longer cause for sectional conflict. Though any event remotely connected with Tammany was usually sufficient to send the entire Republican press into paroxysms of righteous indignation, Harper's Weekly paid tribute to the speech as a sound analysis of the constitutional factors resulting in rebellion.³ The New York Times sneeringly reviewed the proceedings without additional comment about the speech.⁴

¹New York Times, February 10, 1883, p. 3.

²Ibid.

³"Wade Hampton's Speech," XXXI (July 16, 1887), 498.

⁴July 5, 1887, p. 5.

Lee's best-known reconciliatory speech, "The Flag of the Union Forever," was delivered September 17, 1887, before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick and the Hibernian Society of Philadelphia on the occasion of the Centennial of the adoption of the Constitution. The affair, an afternoon banquet, was held in flag-festooned St. George's Hall. The most distinguished guest was President Grover Cleveland. Chairman of the meeting was Andrew G. Curtin, Pennsylvania's war governor, who gave Lee the following introduction:

We have to-day a gentleman whom I am glad to call my friend, though during the war he was in dangerous and unpleasant proximity to me. He once threatened the Capitol of this great state. I did not wish to see him come, and was very glad when he went away. He was then my enemy and I was his. But thank God, that is past; and in the enjoyment of the rights and interests common to all as American citizens, I am his friend and he is my friend. I introduce to you Governor Fitzhugh Lee.¹

Responding to the welcome, Lee expressed his gladness for the restoration of the Union. He did not see how the conflict could have been avoided because it came from two valid interpretations of the Constitution. The Virginians fought hard because they believed in their cause. Lee now stressed mutual acceptance and cooperation as vital to the harmony of the sections, and stated that if he had known those around him before the war, he could never have been induced to fight them.² No data was discovered concerning the delivery of this speech.

Analysis of Lee's Reconciliation Speeches

Four reconciliation speeches by Fitzhugh Lee were discovered.

¹Reed, op. cit., p. 710.

²Ibid.

Two of these, one delivered at the Mayor's reception at Boston Music Hall and the other at a reception given by the Thirteenth Regiment, New York National Guard, are very brief. The other two, at the Thirteenth Regiment banquet and before the Hibernian Society of Philadelphia, are somewhat longer. Unlike Gordon, Watterson, and Hampton, Fitzhugh Lee talked in rather general terms about reconciliation, but did not make his reunion addresses the vehicle for evaluating the political and economic issues of the day. Thus his speeches do not contain the controversial material found in some of the utterances of Watterson, Gordon, and Hill, and no indication has been discovered of any unfavorable reactions to his speaking.

The longest speech, and also the one which apparently expresses Lee's feelings on reunion in the greatest detail, is "The Flag of the Union Forever," delivered as a part of the Constitutional Centennial in Philadelphia, September 17, 1887. This speech began with a reference to the occasion, in which Lee expressed his pleasure at renewing old acquaintances. The restoration of the Union, he said, had been a great blessing to the country. The civil conflict had been unavoidable because neither side could discover an adequately clear legal interpretation of states' rights in the ambiguous language of the Constitution, but the war had settled the matter, and the country once again presented a united front to the world. Virginia's actions had always been zealous; she had fought hard and was now working earnestly for the betterment of the Union. Virginians fought for no material considerations, but rather for the purpose of defending their beliefs. A better acquaintance between the people of North and South might well have forestalled the war, but now that the sections were becoming well

acquainted, future conflicts were sure to be settled by peaceful means.¹

Arrangement

Lee began his speech at Philadelphia, as elsewhere, with a reference to the occasion and an expression of his pleasure at being present. An element not found in the Philadelphia address which is present in the introductions of the three other speeches is an interpretation of the occasion as a symbol of the reconciliation which he said was taking place throughout the country. At his reception in New York, for example, he commented that he was glad to see his friends once more, "because I see in these hospitalities the spirit of good feeling and reconciliation which is coming to pervade all classes of our people." Interestingly enough, he did not speak of himself as a spokesman of the entire South, but only of Virginia.

He stated a common theme, in somewhat differing words, in each of his four speeches. His thesis, as expressed at Philadelphia, was: "We have now a great and glorious future in front of us, and it is Virginia's duty to do all that she can to promote the honor and glory of this country." At the Thirteenth Regiment Banquet, he stated: "We of Virginia recognize that we are a part of the great American Union." His speech at the Thirteenth Regiment Reception contained the theme: "Virginia has no other ambition now but to further our common interests and to strive with New York to see which shall be the brightest jewel in the coronet bound about the brow of the Union."

All four speeches are compact in arrangement, with close

¹Ibid., pp. 710-12.

Human nature is everywhere the same; and when intestine strife occurs, we will doubtless always be able by a conservative, pacific course to pass smoothly over the rugged, rocky edges, and the old Ship of State will be brought into a safe, commodious, Constitutional harbor with the flag of the Union flying over her, and there it will remain.

Modes of Proof

Logical proof

Being an "after-dinner" speech, Lee's address to the Hibernians was not weighted down with logical elements, though some logical materials are to be found. This absence of extensive logical argument is equally apparent in the other three speeches.

Causal relationship.—Lee argued causally from the proposition that the Civil War was unavoidable because it arose from a loose construction of the Constitution. He then showed causally why the Rebels fought so bravely, denying that it was for money, rations, or military glory, and affirming that it was because they believed that a state having entered the Union voluntarily could leave it voluntarily. He also attributed the war to a failure of the sections to become acquainted with one another and to understand mutual problems and aspirations.

General propositions.—Commenting on the future of the country, Lee posed this proposition: "If we are to continue prosperous . . . we will have to make concessions and compliances; we will have to hear with each other and to respect each other's opinions." His closing argument at Philadelphia began with the implied assumption that familiarity leads to respect. He stated "I have become acquainted with Governor Beaver. You could not make me fight him now. If I had known him before

the war, perhaps we would not have got at it." Analysis of Lee's other discovered speeches reveals that logical devices were largely limited to causal reasoning and to occasional enthymemes. At the Thirteenth Regiment Reception, Lee announced that the occasion was auspicious because it marked a decline in sectional spirit. He also defended his enlistment in the Confederate forces on the basis of an honest conviction about the right of a state to secede and a feeling of loyalty to his state. He also causally supported his post-war loyalty to the Union by stating that a united country presented a stronger force in world affairs and that the war had convinced him of the weakness of state sovereignty.

Ethical proof

As a previous visitor to the Hibernian society and as a guest of Pennsylvania's Governor Beaver, as well as being a noted soldier and Governor of Virginia, Lee presumably carried with him a good deal of ethical appeal. At any rate, it was not until the middle of the speech that he chose to make reference to his beliefs and motives, saying that he thanked God the Union had been restored and he was a part of the United States once more. This was his only attempt at ethical proof in the Philadelphia speech. At the Boston reception, Lee made no personal references, while at the Thirteenth Regiment reception he spoke to his soldier audience of his devotion and sacrifice to the Confederate cause. Considering all the speeches, it may be said that Lee did not rely extensively on ethical appeals in his reunion addresses.

Emotional proof

Lee employed humor extensively in his reunion speeches. He

apparently liked anecdotes such as the soap-making story. He seemed less at ease in this mode, however, than in the quips with which he studied his speeches. Witness the awkwardness of the introduction: "The other day I heard a story . . . and I am going to take up your time for a minute by repeating it to you." In employing humorous remarks growing out of his discourse he was more graceful. Noting that he was being entertained by Governor Beaver and that during the war they had fought on opposite sides in the same sector, the speaker commented: "He could not capture me during the war, but he has captured me now. I am a Virginian and used to ride a pretty fast horse, and he could not get close enough to me." This remark evoked laughter from the audience. Describing the outcome of the war, Lee commented wryly: "Pennsylvania, I think, probably got a little the best of it." Speaking in New York, Lee discussed differences in political background and said that while his hosts were used to the idea of paternalistic government, in Virginia "we are getting a little more educated that way than we were." This remark also was greeted with laughter, as was his comment that during a recent senatorial squabble when some senators walked out of the Senate, the South looked to see if New York would secede with them. "We know that considerable trouble began before with the secession of a legislator from the Senate, and we began to look out to see if the trouble would begin at this end the same way." It may be said in summary that suggestiveness was achieved to a limited degree by the use of metaphor and by an extensive use of humor, most of it in the nature of remarks growing out of the discourse.

Aside from an extensive use of humor, little else in Lee's .

speeches can be classified as constituting pathetic proof. At the New York banquet he appealed to the assumed admiration of his soldier audience for bravery and devotion to duty, attributing these qualities to the Confederate soldier. Beyond this, his pathetic appeals were negligible.

Style

Accuracy

Lee's reunion speeches contain a number of examples of specific language. The soapmaking story, cited above, illustrates his tendency to accurate expression:

Old Mr. Washington and Mrs. Washington, the parents of George, found on one occasion that their supply of soap for the use of the family at Westmoreland had been exhausted, and so they decided to make some family soap. They made the necessary arrangements and gave the requisite instructions to the family servant. After an hour or so the servant returned and reported to them that he could not make that soap. "Why not," he was asked, "haven't you got all the materials?" "Yes," he replied, "but there is something wrong." The old folks proceeded to investigate, and they found they had actually got the ashes of the little cherry tree that George had cut down with his hatchet, and there was no lye in it.

In the same speech, Lee mentioned that he had an engagement later that evening at the Academy of Music and would be escorted there by Governor Beaver, whom he had previously met in Richmond. Had he been less conscious of specific language, he might have stated merely that he had an appointment and would be escorted by an acquaintance. Addressing the Thirteenth Regiment of the New York Guard, he informed his listeners that he had been at West Point when the war broke out, rather than describing his location as in the North, or in New York state. He expressed thanks for his welcome at the Boston Centennial to "the City

of Boston and its vicinity." Lee was also inclined to seek exact verbs. Virginia, he said, was desirous of "striving" with New York to see which would be the more outstanding state. The country had a great duty to "discharge" in order to "perpetuate" the Union. Lee seems to have exercised an effort to choose concrete language whenever possible in order to supply a fairly accurate impression of the idea he was seeking to convey.

Force

In Lee's Philadelphia speech, as elsewhere, he used a great many words of one, two, and three syllables. Longer words tended to be relatively familiar, such as "Hibernian," "Society," "entertainment," "variation," "original," "necessary," "differences," "controversy," "Constitution," "Confederates," "compliances" and "commodious." With the possible exception of "compliances" and "commodious," these longer words were probably no bar to communication. In general, Lee used words seemingly suited by their shortness or familiarity to a forceful oral style.

The longest sentence in Lee's Philadelphia address is the concluding one, containing seventy-eight words, while the one immediately preceding it contains seventy-one. The three other longest sentences contain fifty-six words each. Others are much shorter, all running to fewer than thirty words. The most common construction of sentences of more than ten words in length is compound. "And" is the most commonly used connective. Approximately an equal number of short compound and simple sentences were employed by Lee. The following samples from Lee's speeches illustrate the flavor of his sentences. The first is from his reception by the Thirteenth Regiment of the New York National

Guard:

I am glad to see you again because I see in these hospitalities the spirit of good feeling and reconciliation which is coming to pervade all classes of our people. When the war broke out I was at West Point. My associations and creed were with the people of the South, and I thought it my duty to cast my lot with them. But when our sun went down I recognized that secession was not the remedy for the ills we complained of, and I became once more a citizen of the United States, with an earnest desire to promote the glory and welfare of our country.

On the following evening at a banquet given by the Thirteenth Regiment,

Lee commented in part:

We of Virginia recognize that we are a part of the great American Union. The spirit of peace and reconciliation is dawning upon us, and is destined to sweep from one state to another. We have all of us a great duty to discharge if we would perpetuate the Republic. State sovereignty was the doctrine upon which we Virginians were brought up. You, of New York, looked to the paternal Government, and we are getting a little more educated that way than we were.

Because of the relative freedom of the speech from extremely long sentences and the compound construction of the longer ones, sentence length and structure probably combined with easily intelligible words to form a forceful oral style.

Lee was fond of using parallelism in his reunion speeches. Describing the sun of the Union, he said that "its light is shining over Virginia as well as over the rest of the country." In regard to the Constitution, he commented: "Virginia construed it one way; Pennsylvania construed it another." Describing close acquaintance as a cure for sectional animosity, he used the parallelism: "If the Governors had known each other, and if all the people had been known to each other. . . ." He indicated that he believed in the staunch character of all Americans by noting: "There are just as many good men in Maine as there are in Texas, and just as many good men in Texas as

there are in Maine." At Boston, he announced: "I unite with those gentlemen in thanking you, in thanking the City of Boston. . . ."

The Confederate soldiers, he said, came "from their cabins, from their ploughs, from their houses, and from their families." The speaker occasionally used an antithetical construction, as in the comment to the New York Guard members that "I am glad to meet you, not as citizens of New York, not as citizens of Virginia, but as fellow citizens of America. . . ." It may be concluded that Lee's sentence arrangement probably combined with sentence structure and word choice to give him a rather forceful oral style.

Suggestiveness

Lee employed figures of speech sparingly, though he did refer metaphorically to "the sun of the Union, which, once obscured, is now again in the full stages of its glory; and . . . its light is shining over Virginia as well as the rest of the country." Another metaphor was employed in stating that "Virginia has no other ambition but to . . . be the brightest jewel in the coronet bound about the brow of the Union." The last phrase has a strong alliterative flavor, as does the phrase "from their cabins, from their ploughs, from their houses and from their families to make them fight as they fought. . . ." Lee stated that by a conservative course, America could "pass smoothly over the rugged, rocky edges, and the old Ship of State will be brought into a commodious Constitutional harbor. . . ." He appears not to have made a conscious effort to employ words with an emotional connotation for the sake of their effect.

Ease

Lee apparently refrained from the use of contractions and idiom

in his reunion speeches, but did employ direct address to some extent. He used the unadorned pronoun "you" a great deal, employing such specific phrases as "you of New York" to a very limited degree. This frequent use of "you" gives the speech an informal, conversational quality which might not have resulted from a more formal direct address. This device may be said to have added a considerable ease to his style.

Summary

Lee's style involved some specific language. A degree of economy was achieved through short, relatively uncomplicated sentences employing simple language. Parallelism and some antithesis are readily observable. Suggestiveness was attempted through metaphorical statements. The speaker used simple direct address as a means of giving ease to his style.

John Brown Gordon

Though lacking the aristocratic background of Hampton and Lee, John B. Gordon employed an engaging personality and considerable native ability in attaining a position of national prominence. He was born in Upson County, Georgia, and worked for a time as a miner. He studied law, and at the outbreak of the war entered the Confederate Army, where he attained the rank of lieutenant general. He was a colorful military figure, often wounded, and led the last charge at Appomattox. Following the war he settled in Atlanta and became interested in local politics. In 1868 he was defeated for the governorship of Georgia by R. F. Bullock, a newly-pardoned "scalawag," who had the backing of Radicals in the Congress. In 1872, Gordon represented

the Georgia Democracy at the Democratic National Convention, and in the same year defeated Benjamin Hill and Alexander H. Stephens for United States Senator. He served three non-consecutive terms in the Senate, as well as being governor of Georgia from 1886 to 1900. His political interests extended to neighboring states as well. He aided Lucius Lamar in ending carpetbag rule in Mississippi and helped Wade Hampton in his successful gubernatorial campaign of 1876.¹

Audiences and Occasions of Gordon's Reunion Speaking

Gordon gained his greatest reputation as a speaker with his lecture, "The Last Days of the Confederacy," which was delivered a number of times in both the North and the South, but he spoke to Northerners on several other occasions. The first of these was afforded by an invitation from the Boston Merchants' Association to visit Boston in April, 1878. Gordon, in his second senatorial term, had attracted attention in the Senate and elsewhere by his advocacy of the South as a field of investment for Northern and European capital. His name had been prominently mentioned, according to the New York Times, to head a foreign economic mission which would invite additional trade and commerce with countries abroad and would encourage investment, particularly in the South. The Bostonians, eager to secure first-hand information on the new economic frontier, invited Gordon to address them on the evening of April 29. The Boston Evening Transcript described the event as follows:

The visiting Southern congressmen . . . were entertained on Saturday evening by their hosts--the commercial club--in a

¹Malone, op. cit., VII, p. 425.

banquet at the Brunswick. The company assembled in the spacious parlors shortly before three o'clock and after the round of introductions preceded to the dining hall. The party numbered 150. . . .

Soon after six o'clock Mr. Candler called the company to order and opened the feast of reason in a renewed welcome to the guests, and introduced Senator Gordon of Georgia, who spoke in response to the toast, "Our Southern Guests."¹

Gordon told the merchants that internal strife in the country was dead. and could never recur. Whatever future conflicts might occur would be between nations, not sections. Turning to industrial matters, he warned that the South, with her mild climate, coal and iron, and plentiful labor, would soon challenge the Northeast's position of industrial leadership. The interests of capital and labor were distinctly separated in the South and that area would never harbor labor trouble.² This separation might seem to a twentieth century observer a prime cause of labor-management friction, but apparently Gordon was suggesting that labor would not presume to violate the prerogatives of management by striking for higher wages or shorter hours. Though he believed in every opportunity to better the Negro, Gordon declared, it must be realized that the colored man's intelligence was inferior to that of the white. The Negro would never be disfranchised in the South, because the weight of his vote was needed in the South to secure full representation in Congress. Gordon received another opportunity on the following night to repeat his message:

The . . . party were entertained at dinner at the Revere House by Mayor Pierce. Gov. Rice and some prominent people of Boston were also present, the whole gathering numbering

¹Boston Evening Transcript, April 29, 1878, p. 1.

²New York Times, April 30, 1878, p. 5.

25. There was but little formality for the gathering, although the dinner itself was an elaborate affair.

Senator Gordon, toward the end made some remarks called up by a proposition from Mr. Kennard that the health of the guests be drunk, and Gov. Rice spoke briefly, but with those exceptions there was nothing like speech-making. Gen. Gordon's speech was in the same general vein as the one at the Commercial Club dinner on Saturday night.¹

In November, 1887, Gordon undertook a rapid swing through Ohio designed to bolster the political fortunes of Thomas Powell, the state gubernatorial candidate running against J. B. Foraker, a consistent Republican flourisher of the "bloody shirt." With the election of Grover Cleveland to the presidency in 1885, the sectional issue seemed relegated to a place behind such domestic issues as tariff and currency reform. That there was some life remaining in it was demonstrated by the threats of such men as Henry Cabot Lodge and John Sherman to use federal troops in counteracting the flagrant disregard of many Southerners for the terms of the Fifteenth Amendment. Foraker consequently addressed as many of his campaign attacks against the Democratic party as toward the abilities of his opponent, Powell. It was Gordon who undertook to refute Foraker's charges in a series of three speeches at Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland almost on the eve of the election.

Gordon's first attempt at this variety of political canvassing came at the Highland House, Cincinnati, on the evening of October 28, 1887. Located as it was in extreme Southern Ohio, and possessing one of the more prominent Democratic newspapers of the time, the Enquirer, Cincinnati had strong Democratic leanings and could be expected to afford Gordon an energetic response. His two-hour address

¹Boston Evening Transcript, April 30, 1878, p. 1.

was heard by 5000 people, according to one estimate, with several hundred turned away. The speech was received enthusiastically by the audience, which included "an unusually large number of colored men." Discounting the obviously partisan nature of the reporting, we can still take the following account as indicating a favorable response:

Gov. Gordon's appearance was a signal for a most enthusiastic ovation of welcome. The great audience arose to its feet as one man and cheered, shouted, yelled, stomped feet, waved handkerchiefs, and threw hats in the air, renewing these demonstrations again and again, for more than five minutes. When quiet was finally restored Governor Gordon began his address. . . . As an orator he is a master. His every utterance carries with it to his audience the conviction of candor, sincerity, truth and manliness. He is magnetic to a remarkable degree. He seems to draw his auditors right to him. He thrills and electrifies them. At times he is low-voiced and gentle and sweet as the murmuring of a placid brook; then again he is stormy and terrible and tempestuous as the angry, storm-tossed billow. He is a finished elocutionist and true orator. His stage presence is grace itself. He is very happy in his gestures. Throughout his long address the immense audience sat spell-bound. During the two hours and over that he spoke not a single soul left the hall. At times the enthusiasm of his hearers was indistinguishable. Every sentence or two throughout the speech was punctuated with cheers and applause. At times these noisy demonstrations of approval continued for three and four minutes, swelling up wave after wave, and making it impossible for the speaker to continue. . . .¹

This ovation was prompted by a lengthy exposition of conditions in the South as seen through Gordon's eyes. He described Georgia as inherently loyal to the Union because she helped found it and the South as being mistaken but always honest. Southern Negroes were not mistreated, he stated, because they formed such a vital part of the labor force. They did not vote because they had no interest in voting. Gordon's only mission in life, he maintained, was to promote good will and good government. The only way in which national unity could be

¹Cincinnati Enquirer, October 29, 1887, p. 5.

accomplished, he argued, was by defeating the "bloody shirt" element at the polls.¹ Despite shouted questions from the floor, he refused to mention names or discuss local issues.

Following this successful beginning, Gordon moved confidently upstate toward Dayton, Columbus, and Cleveland. During his triumphant reception at Cincinnati, however, the Ohio Republicans had not been idle. They caused to be reproduced in the Dayton Journal a large portion of Gordon's testimony before the "Joint Select Committee to Inquire Into the Conditions of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States on July 27, 1871," quoting him as denying any knowledge or connection with the Ku Klux Klan in Georgia, though admitting that he belonged to a "private group of citizens" committed to maintaining law and order in the state.² In addition to the Klannery charge, the Georgian was confronted with a more current accusation. Just before leaving on his Ohio trip, the Journal related, Gordon had presided at Confederate Day at Macon, Georgia. Scheduled events were a Confederate reunion, speeches, and the appearance of Jefferson Davis. Gordon, as master of ceremonies, twice introduced Davis with towering eulogies. In an emotional platform scene, according to the reporter, Davis had kissed, fondled, and waved a large Confederate flag while the crowd held a passionate demonstration and Gordon wrung scores of outstretched hands. The Journal also claimed that a correspondent had observed an American flag being ripped from a pike carried in the demonstration.³

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 2.

³October 29, 1887, p. 2.

As a consequence of this unfavorable publicity and resultant protests from local G. A. R. posts, Gordon's scheduled appearance at the National Soldier's Home in Dayton was cancelled and he moved on to Columbus where he appeared at the City Hall on the evening of November 1. In view of the Journal's lack of enthusiasm for Gordon, its report of the Columbus and Cleveland receptions are probably not exaggerated. In the capital city, an estimated 3000 persons were present, with about that number turned away, and the speaker was "frequently cheered" during the speech. Here he was largely on the defensive in regard to the charges made against him, and found little time for a review of Republican carpetbag activities or a pledge of Southern loyalty. He pronounced his life an open book and declared that he had always acted with integrity and regard for the best interests of his country. He designated himself as the friend of the Negro, and for evidence quoted extensively from newspaper articles by H. M. Turner, Negro Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church and editor of a Negro newspaper, the Southern Recorder. In regard to the charges of Ku Klux membership, he attempted to defend the necessity for a private organization of citizens to keep order during the chaotic days of reconstruction, but never denied being a member of the Klan. Near the end of the speech Gordon found time to compliment the Union soldier and denounce Congressional Reconstruction as having created the Solid South because the South needed to protect herself politically.

Gordon's last speech of the tour was at the Cleveland Music Hall on the following evening before a "large" audience. Once again he was forced to spend most of his time in defense against the attacks

launched by the Cleveland Leader.¹ He talked on his friendship with the Negro and reiterated his explanation of the necessity for Southern citizens to band together for protection during reconstruction. In a conciliatory vein, he stated:

I have not come to Ohio to discuss local issues. I am profoundly impressed with the conviction that the sooner the barriers which divide Ohio and Georgia are broken down, the better for your interests and mine. I have sometimes thought that I would be willing to see one more war, that we might march under the Stars and Stripes, shoulder to shoulder, against a common foe. If I could call the lightning down tonight, I would blast forever this horrible feeling of sectional hate.²

This concluded Gordon's foray into "enemy territory" on a mission in which politics and reconstruction were closely affiliated.

During the decade after 1880, joint reunions of Confederate and Union veterans were increasingly common. They usually took the form of "home-and-home" celebrations involving G. A. R. posts and survivors of regiments or divisions of one of the Rebel armies. The first of this series to be held on the scene of the Battle of Gettysburg took place on July 3, 1886, the twenty-third anniversary of the battle, and involved Generals Gregg, Hampton, McIntosh, and McClelland. In 1887 the Gettysburg reunion was again held, this time featuring survivors of Pickett's Division and the Philadelphia Brigade, units which had been involved in perhaps the heaviest fighting of the battle.³

The following year every effort was put forth to make Gettysburg one of the major reunions.⁴ John B. Gordon was one of the principal

¹See editorial pages, October 28-November 1, 1887.

²Dayton Journal, November 2, 1887, p. 1.

³George L. Kilmer, "A Note of Peace," Century, XXXVI (June, 1888), 440ff.

⁴St. Louis Post Dispatch, July 5, 1887, p. 4.

speakers. A reporter of the Cincinnati Enquirer supplied the following account of Gordon's appearance on the opening day of the celebration:

The men from the old South were almost lost amid the throng from the old North. Wearers of the blue were numbered by the thousands. The men in gray did not number hundreds, but the latter represented not only the membership, but the sentiment of the army that for various reasons could not participate in a reunion upon Gettysburg's twenty-fifth anniversary. . . .

. . . the reunion of the blue and the gray . . . may be safely called the most impressive, the most hearty, and the most dignified and inspiring of any of the meetings of survivors of the war that have occurred since Appomattox.

The place was the National Cemetery. Five thousand spectators. . . looked on and cheered and laughed and wept by turns. . . . The veterans and the throng of people poured through and gathered about the arbor at the western end of the great enclosure. They stood closely together. . . . The center of the gathering was an arbor, a platform made of earth walled in with brick, about 12 feet above the ground. Brick columns support a roof, and these columns are covered with ivy. On the platform were gathered the group of veteran officers. . . .¹

When Gordon appeared at the rostrum, he was greeted with cheers, and "throughout his speech he was interrupted by cries of 'good,' 'hurrah,' and other expressions of pleasure and approval, such as must have been flattering in the extreme to Georgia's Chief Executive."² He told his listeners that he found this meeting more pleasant than on the occasion when they had confronted one another as armed foes. He reminisced briefly about the battle and then stated that magnanimity was perhaps the greatest virtue known to man and that the Union forces possessed it in a high degree. He joined in the dedication of a newly-erected monument to all those who fell at Gettysburg and pledged that

¹July 3, 1888, p. 5.

²Pittsburgh Commercial Gazette, July 3, 1888, p. 4.

the South would always fight for the freedom and unity of the republic.

Surprisingly, in contrast with the Grand Army of the Republic, whose organization was almost concurrent with the end of the war, the Confederates did not merge at a national level until 1889, with the formation of the United Confederate Veterans. It was not surprising however, that the Southerners should choose John B. Gordon as their first commander.¹ As spokesman for all the Confederate Veteran posts, Gordon endorsed in 1891 a proposal from E. T. Lee of Monticello, Illinois, for a combined Union-Confederate reunion at the 1892 World's Fair in Chicago. In accepting the proposition, Gordon wrote: "I trust that many thousands may meet and greet each other at the proposed gathering, and I am sure that good, and only good, can result from such a communion."²

Following his choice as United Confederate Veteran commander, Gordon became the quasi-official spokesman of the dead Confederacy, and his lecture, "The Last Days of the Confederacy," was accepted by many as the final word on the Civil War. One reporter wrote of the lecture:

He has a brilliant lecture called "The Last Days of the Confederacy," which he has delivered with great acceptance. . . . In it he tried to do full justice to both the Blue and the Gray. He shows that courage, endurance, constancy and loyalty of duty are characteristics, not of the North or the South, distinctly, but of our common Americanism. General Gordon expresses the rapidly-growing and widely prevalent sentiment of the South. This better sentiment is the result of better acquaintance between the sections. . . .³

¹Proceedings of the Convention for the Organization for the United Confederate Veterans, I (Richmond: J. T. Partridge Co., 1889), 3-22.

²New York Times, August 17, 1891, p. 5.

³Independent, V&I (April 25, 1895), 543.

The lecture was delivered several times in Chicago, the first on the evening of November 26, 1893. Apparently it was a pleasant experience for all:

When Gen. John B. Gordon of Virginia [sic] was introduced to an audience in the Music Hall by ex-Chief Justice Noah Davis, last night, he was greeted by an outburst of applause that would have won any Confederate soldier to the Union side.

Around Gen. Gordon on the stage were gathered a number of prominent military men who had fought in the Civil War, and during the course of his lecture he made mentions of them.

The lecture was full of interesting reminiscences. At the end of it, Gen. Daniel Sickles proposed that a vote of thanks be tendered to Gen. Gordon, and the entire audience arose and gave it.¹

On December 22, 1895, he was sponsored at the Music Hall by the Chicago Press Club, speaking on "The First [sic] Days of the Confederacy." An auditor commented dryly: "It had been announced he would change his subject and lecture on 'War with England, and the Monroe Doctrine,' but not more than ten minutes were devoted to this subject." The same account indicated that despite the slightly altered title, the same speech had been delivered before under the more familiar "Last Days" designation, and seemed to give the audience "peculiar and unbounded pleasure." The lecture was "applauded with heartiness from beginning to end."² In concluding the "Monroe Doctrine" section of the speech, Gordon made one especially popular pronouncement concerning the current tension with England:

No one who knows what war means will speak upon this matter without deep thought and grave deliberation. However, as a representative of the South, and as the present Commander-in-Chief of the Confederate Veterans, I consider myself safe in saying that if War should come again the boys who wore the gray, old as they are now, would come to the front once more and their old

¹New York Times, November 26, 1893, p. 5.

²Chicago Tribune, December 22, 1895, p. 4.

rebel yell would be heard beyond the Canadian borders.

This declaration, one account states, "was greeted with frantic enthusiasm and it was many minutes before the cheering subsided sufficiently to allow the speaker to proceed." One of the most enthusiastic elements in the audience was a detachment of the Illinois First Infantry, whose members "greeted Gen. Gordon's patriotic utterances with wild enthusiasm."¹

Back at the Music Hall February 16, 1895, Gordon spoke this time under the sponsorship of the Columbia Post of the Chicago G. A. R. The speech was this time the climax of a two-day Union-Confederate reunion. The previous night the Columbia Post had sponsored a banquet "notable as an occasion when former foes shook hands and agreed they were fellow-citizens of a common country." In entering the Music Hall for the Lecture, Gordon was escorted by G. A. R. men and Confederate Veterans marching arm-in-arm. H. M. McDowell, Department Commander of the Illinois G. A. R., made the introductory statement: "Welcome with me this proud, brave soldier, comrade to all the brave men, North and South, who will be sung in song and story while the stars shall reign." This appeal was met with "a round of cheers."²

Gordon was accustomed to single out for praise some local Union or Confederate veteran in his audience during the presentation of this lecture. This was usually done during his account of one of the many battles in which he had participated. The citation invariably delighted his audience, and on occasion produced other salutary effects. In 1894, Senator Matthew W. Ransom's political fortunes were at a low ebb in

¹St. Louis Post-Dispatch, December 22, 1895, p. 15.

²Chicago Tribune, February 16, 1895, p. 4.

North Carolina, and it appeared that he might lose his seat to a populist candidate. The mayor of the city of Charlotte directed to him this analysis:

The country people, as it seems to us, are at present against you. The only positive manner of rallying them would be by getting Gen. Gordon to deliver his lecture on 'The Last Days of the Confederacy,' inviting the country people and getting him to make an allusion to you!¹

The series of eight reconciliation speeches, capped by the "Last Days" lecture, represents all the discovered reunion addresses of John B. Gordon in the North.

Analysis of Gordon's Reconciliation Speeches

Of the eight discovered reconciliatory speeches of John B. Gordon, his speech at the Democratic rally in Cincinnati on October 28, 1887, may in many ways be considered representative of his utterances on reunion. It encompasses all the ideas which he expressed on prior and subsequent occasions, with the exception of his views on the economic future of the South. Being of somewhat greater length than his other reunion addresses, the speech develops his lines of argument to a fuller extent than on other similar occasions. It is perhaps not typical in its use of statistics and factual evidence. This is probably accounted for by the fact that the other occasions on which Gordon spoke included three after-dinner situations, a public lecture, and a monument dedication, none of which called for extensive quotation of statistics. Speaking with one eye on his critics, Gordon also engaged in more refutation in his Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland speeches

¹Comer Van Woodward, Origins of the New South (University, Louisiana: The Littlefield Fund for Southern History of the University of Texas, 1951), p. 158.

than in the other five addresses. Despite these deviations from his usual course, however, the Cincinnati speech provides a reasonably typical illustration of his speaking and will serve as a basis for an exposition of the characteristics of his reunion addresses.

In his introduction to the Cincinnati speech, he decided on "my friends" as a suitable salutation, after verbally rejecting half a dozen other terms, and professed only the most patriotic aims in making the speech. He described in detail why the Southern people loved the Union, recalling the historical details of the South's contributions in building the Republic. Next he defended the honesty and integrity of the South, saying that she had seceded because of a differing but honest interpretation of the Constitution, had fought valiantly for what she believed, and had accepted the consequences of the war in good grace. He defended the action of the Southern people in honoring Jeff Davis and other symbols of the Confederacy at a recent celebration in Macon. It was possible to revere the symbols of this glory, he said, without implying disloyalty to the Union. He followed this argument with a lengthy section on the progress and treatment of the Negro, describing the loyalty of the colored men during the war, how they were duped by greedy carpetbaggers during reconstruction, and how they had made phenomenal advancement under Southern white leadership. In support of this last point he quoted statistics on such matters as land ownership, property valuation, and school enrollment, though failing to cite the source of his statistics. Next he attempted to explain why the Negroes did not vote. They did not vote Republican, he said, because they realized that the Democrats had their best interests to heart, and did not vote Democratic because that party would be put into office anyway. In his peroration, Gordon reiterated the purity of his motives

in making the speech and then launched an attack on sectional animosity and those who would perpetuate it, ending with a plea for a Democratic vote as the best means of ending regional bitterness.¹

Arrangement

As at Cincinnati, Gordon began all his reconciliation speeches with a reference to the occasion and a declaration of his motives in speaking. This declaration at Cincinnati was as follows:

I am here to-night as a citizen of another State and another section. I am here by the invitation of a committee; but let me admonish you in advance that I am not here to mingle in local politics, to discuss State candidates, but I am here to make an appeal for one short hour against the effort which has been made for many long years to build up a barrier between the fellow-citizens of a common country.

In all the speeches except the one to the Boston Commercial Club and the speech at the dinner honoring his visit to Boston, he made a similar declaration of his desire to destroy sectionalism. The Boston speeches he allegedly gave to extoll the commercial opportunities in the South. Gordon apparently did not attempt to establish a single thesis for any speech beyond the very general idea of promoting sectional good will. Indeed, the Cincinnati speech contains at least five major theses, loosely related except as they contribute to the general idea that the South desired the good will of the North. These theses are: (1) The people of the South have good reason to love the Union; (2) The integrity and honesty of the South cannot be questioned; (3) Salutations to the Confederacy do not imply disloyalty to the Union; (4) The Southerners do not oppress the Negro; and (5) A Democratic vote is a vote for unity and good government. These premises are inter-

¹Cincinnati Enquirer, October 29, 1887, p. 8.

changeable, and do not form a logical pattern as they appear in the speech.

Compare this arrangement of themes with those in his Columbus speech, given later in the same tour. Here six ideas are expressed: (1) Gordon is not afraid of having his life subjected to the closest scrutiny; (2) Sectional prejudice has been kept alive for political purposes; (3) Gordon found it necessary to band with his neighbors during reconstruction for their mutual protection; (4) The Union soldier is a brave man; (5) President Cleveland is a satisfactory president; and (6) The South acted in good faith in seceding. Here, as at Cincinnati, Gordon mixed arguments with no apparent regard for their cumulative effect.

The only deviation from this formless pattern of arrangement is found in his address to the Commercial Club of Boston and at the public dinner on the following evening, where he used virtually the same speech. Here he presented two closely-related ideas as major points: (1) He had made the trip to New England to view the industrial development of the area; (2) He had also made the trip for the purpose of describing industrial opportunity in the South and warning New England of the South's desire to rival her commercially.

As may be noted in part from the foregoing discussion, none of the speeches exemplify the Aristotelean concept of arrangement. While all may be said to possess introductions, there is nowhere a "statement" in the classical sense, and the "argument" is used intermittently through the speech, rather than to bolster a central theme.

All of Gordon's speeches contain recognizable epilogues. For example, he concluded his speech at Cincinnati with a reference to the

forthcoming election:

Whether you vote for one man or the other--I don't intend to mention any names here--let me beg of you, for the interest of posterity, your children and mine, for the interest of this great Government, for the interest of this Union in which we are all interested, for the interest of liberty, rise in your might and, by the inexorable fiat of a mighty public opinion, frown down forever the spirit which I have been discussing to-night. Now I shall say good-by.

His "Last Days of the Confederacy" concluded on this note:

By the memory of the Fathers who bequeathed us this priceless heritage; by the names and deeds of Northern heroes, living and dead . . . by all these we unite in solemn compact that this American people shall know intestine war no more; but shall forever remain an unbroken brotherhood from sea to sea. By all these, and by the resistless fiat of an inexorable American sentiment, we proclaim that the American flag shall protect every American citizen on all oceans and in all lands. . . .

But whatever be the geographical limits over which destiny decrees it to float as the symbol of our national sovereignty, there shall at least be no boundaries to its moral sway; but as long as political truth triumphs or liberty survives this flag of our Fathers shall remain the proudest and most potential emblem of human freedom in all the world.

Modes of Proof

Logical proof

Reasoning from authority.--Gordon made very limited use of the authority of others for support of his arguments. Near the middle of the Cincinnati speech, he quoted Grant as having been "ready to approve the building of monuments to the brave men who fought him," but developed no argument from this quotation to defend the erection of Confederate memorials. At the close of the speech he argued that there were no more degraded men than those who continued to flourish the bloody shirt at the loyal and regenerated South. This argument was initiated as follows:

I am here to invoke the spirit that actuated that great Captain, Ulysses S. Grant, in the last hours of his life.

I had rather be Grant, dead and buried, lying cold and lifeless in his coffin, with his grave mildewed by the tears of all his countrymen, than to be the living, active triumphant agent of such a passion as is sought to be perpetuated here.

What do you think he would say to the men who are seeking to put the blush to the spirit in which he died? Manifesting to his country with almost his last words, as his eyes turned the last time to look upon his country, he exclaimed, "Thank God, the country is at last reunited."

Gordon inferred from this citation that it was the responsibility of the Ohio people to put down forever the anti-Southern feeling which still existed in their state. This was a thinly-veiled reference to the campaign tactics of the incumbent gubernatorial candidate, Benjamin Foraker. In view of the reverence in which the recently-deceased Grant had come to be held, and considering that Grant's forces had defeated the armies in which Gordon had been a general, the Southerner could hardly have chosen stronger authority for his arguments. Gordon's only other use of authority in his discovered reconciliatory speaking was at Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland, where he quoted extensively from H. M. Turner of Georgia, whom he identified as being Negro Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church and editor of a daily newspaper, the Southern Recorder. In the Ohio cities, the speaker read editorials by Turner which lauded the governor as the friend and protector of the colored race.

Reasoning from example.--Gordon used an inductive process rather extensively in support of the first main issue in the Cincinnati speech--namely that the South could not hate the Union because the Union had been largely founded by Southerners. The argument was as follows:

- I. The Southern states contributed much of the territory which formed the Union.
 - A. Virginia surrendered the territory out of which Ohio was formed.
 - B. Georgia relinquished claims to the land reaching to the Mississippi.
 - C. Jefferson, a Southerner, accomplished the Louisiana purchase.
 - D. The Pacific territory was acquired under Polk.
 - E. Scott and Taylor led the fighting in the War with Mexico.
- II. Washington and Madison were outstanding leaders in the writing of the Constitution.

In establishing the proposition that the recent Confederate reunion and celebration in Macon, Georgia, honoring Jefferson Davis had not been a regeneration of Rebel Spirit, Gordon cited the following examples: (1) There were at least 50,000 Union flags and only about a dozen Confederate flags on display in the city; (2) Jefferson Davis's carriage was draped with the Stars and Stripes; (3) The official headquarters building was draped with Union flags; (4) Gordon's speech in introducing Davis was based on the theme that the Union had been rehabilitated on a firmer foundation than ever before.

He next used examples to support the proposition that the slaves had not been mistreated by their masters, stating: (1) The North was able to enlist only a handful of blacks in their armies; (2) In four years of war, no black man was imprisoned for any crime against a white; (3) Only loyalty kept the Negro on the plantation, because he had little to fear from the very young and the infirm men who remained at home. Closely related to this assertion was the contention that the Southern Negro had made far more rapid progress under Democratic rather than Radical rule, which was supported as follows: (1) In 1875, according to tax rolls, Georgia Negroes owned 393,000 acres; in 1887, the total was 813,725 acres; (2) Ownership value of "town property"

in 1875 was \$1,203,000, a figure which had doubled by 1887; (3) "Household property" increased in value from \$21,186 in 1875 to \$901,000 in 1887; (4) Enrollment of Negro children in public schools was 6665 in 1871, and in 1886, the figure had increased to 122,872. No source was cited for these figures, which represent substantially all the reasoning from example which Gordon employed in this speech.

As may be seen, he seldom limited himself to one piece of evidence, but was accustomed to employ a number of examples whenever possible. Such a tendency is likewise observable especially in his lecture, "The Last Days of the Confederacy," where he employed seven lengthy illustrations to demonstrate that despite the bitterness of the fighting, the war was fought with an underlying spirit of friendliness. He used a similar lengthy chain of examples at Columbus in avoiding the charge that he was a Klansman.

Analogy and comparison.—Gordon's first attempt at logical proof in the Cincinnati speech came immediately after the introduction, and compared the motives and aspirations of the people of Georgia and Ohio. He described the Ohioans as loyal, patriotic, and ambitious, and concluded that these attributes were held in common with his own people. He next compared the attitudes of the North and South toward the right of secession, stating that both were based upon the soundest and most honest of convictions. From here he moved rapidly into a comparison of the Union and the Confederacy, in which he asserted that they possessed in common political and religious liberty, freedom of speech and press, and right of trial by jury. In defending his friendship and loyalty toward Jefferson Davis, Gordon contrasted Davis's position of wealth, respect, and political eminence as he left the

Senate with his degraded, suffering and poverty-stricken condition in 1887, declaring that friendship had come to nothing if such a poor old man were to be deserted.

Gordon's use of comparison is observable in other speeches as well. In "The Solid Union," he cast his arguments in an extensive comparison of secession and war to the proceedings in the courtroom. He described war as "the last court of appeal," and said that the judgment was "formally entered at Appomattox Court House," but was never completely executed and fully confirmed until November 4, 1884, when Cleveland was elected. At the Gettysburg reunion, Gordon began his speech with a comparison of the reunion with the battle which preceded it, though denying that he had the time for a lengthy comparison. It may be concluded that analogy and comparison figured as a major argumentative device in Gordon's reunion speaking, being employed in almost every speech.

Causal relationship.--Several major elements of Gordon's argument at Cincinnati were built upon causal relationship. After posing the question, "Why shouldn't the South love this Union?" he proceeded to note the contributions which the South had made to the establishment of the Union, also employing examples in revealing why the Negro slaves had not turned against their masters.

Gordon answered the question, "Why don't the colored men vote?" by explaining that in state elections many of them did, but that they did not participate in national elections in large numbers simply because they did not want to, and because the carpetbag leaders who shepherded the Negroes to the polls had all disappeared. The last response to his question was, "They have been educated and lost all

interest in the party which robbed them of their school fund and would have robbed them of every right they had for the sake of office." The Cincinnati speech contains the most extensive use of causal reasoning found in any of his reunion speeches, though he used causal relationships twice in Columbus to point out why sectional disunity was being promoted by certain groups and later to show why the citizens of Georgia had banded together for protection. In summary of Gordon's use of causal argument, it may be seen that he was not hesitant to state a proposition and then supply what he saw as causes for the existing condition. He seldom limited himself to stating a single cause, but attempted to cite all causes favorable to his case.

General propositions.—A number of examples can be found in the Cincinnati speech of general propositions from which Gordon moved more or less deductively to conclusions or left conclusions unstated but understood. The first sentence of Gordon's introduction was deductive in nature: "If the good will of this audience is to be measured by the warmth of this greeting, I shall never find words to thank you." In introducing the first argument of his speech, that citizens of Georgia and Ohio should be friends, he also used an enthymeme: "We are fellow-citizens of the greatest and best country on this earth. We are joint managers of the best government on this earth. Why, then, should we not be friends?" From this beginning, Gordon built his lengthy argument concerning the common background of the sections. Part of the material employed was a series of twelve questions, the implied answers to which all indicated that the South had the major stake in the preservation of the Union.

Having attempted to establish that the South had held honest

convictions concerning the right to secede, Gordon asserted that "if a man is honest once, he is pretty apt to stay honest," and proceeded to infer that the Southerners had continued to operate according to motives of honesty throughout the reconstruction era and at present honestly desired mutual fellowship and good will with the North. Under fire for his actions honoring Jefferson Davis the previous week, Gordon replied with an enthymeme which is expandable into the following syllogism: People owe an undying debt of gratitude to those who sacrifice themselves in the public service. Jefferson Davis was such a leader. Therefore the Southerners are honor-bound to maintain their allegiance to Davis.

Still defending the Southern reverence for the symbols of a lost cause, Gordon asserted: "That man honors himself who honors the brave," and proceeded to show that the recent demonstrations were manifestations of this motive. Nearing the end of his speech, Gordon called for questions from the audience, asserting: "Long live the truth, long live justice; long live amity, unity and concord, and then I know liberty will live." In implementing the argument about the South's desire for good government, Gordon worked from the general proposition: "If there are any people on earth who ought to want good Government, it is the poor man." The final appeal of the Cincinnati speech, that Gordon's audience must believe in the South's loyalty and patriotism, began with this generalization: "Liberty in a government like ours must live, if it lives at all, in the intelligence and virtue and cooperation of all the people," and followed with the enthymeme: "How are you going to perpetuate cooperation for the future generation if you teach your children that the children of the southern country

are unworthy of cooperation or confidence."

Gordon relied somewhat less on general propositions in this speech than in some of his other addresses. For example, his speeches to the Boston Commercial Club and the Boston dinner in his honor were made up chiefly of general propositions and inferences from them and contained little supporting evidence or illustration. It may be said in summary that enthymemes formed an integral part of Gordon's oral pattern of reasoning, though the quantity varied from speech to speech.

Summary of logical proof.--Gordon seldom made use of authority in the support of arguments, though he seemed capable of using it effectively on the few occasions when it was employed. Reasoning from example was his chief method of implementing logical appeals. Reasoning by means of analogy and comparison is found in every speech examined and in at least one address formed a major argumentative technique. Gordon employed causal reasoning rather extensively.

Ethical proof

In undertaking consideration of the ethical and emotional appeals employed by John B. Gordon in his Ohio speeches, one must be cognizant of the following details. The Democratic Party had been in the minority in Ohio during most of the preceding twenty-five years. Part of the success of the Republicans was probably due to their repeated identification of the Ohio Democrats with the national Democracy, and of the national party with the "Solid South" Democrats. Governor J. B. Foraker was one of the most consistent advocates of the identify of Democrats and traitors. Frequent reports in the Northern press of the abridgement of Negro rights and of acts indicating

resurgent rebellion in the South came at a particularly inopportune time, considering that after three decades as the national minority party the Democrats had just established a foothold with the election of Grover Cleveland. The most effective method of squelching the slander which the incumbent Foraker was directing against him Democratic gubernatorial opponent, Thomas Powell, seemed to be the appearance of a representative Southerner in Ohio, preaching peace, unity, and loyalty. Thus Gordon's mission at Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland, was not so much to discuss the issues in the Ohio campaign as to touch off a favorable reaction concerning the thinking and conduct of Southern Democratic leaders. It can be seen that much of the efficacy of Gordon's visit depended on his successful establishment of rapport which would evoke a favorable reaction to his presence. The potency of these appeals is not accurately measured by the outcome of the election, which Foraker won easily. The three speeches which Gordon delivered in Ohio under the continual fire of the Republican press could hardly have been expected to reverse, unassisted, the trend of three decades of politics.

The Cincinnati meeting was sponsored by the Hamilton County Democrats, and presumably a majority of those present gave assent by their presence to the same beliefs held by Gordon or expressed tacit willingness to accept them. It is entirely reasonable to assume that a minority, including the "unusually large number of colored men" reported to have been present, came merely out of curiosity, attracted by the name of Gordon. At any rate the audience indicated by their actions preceding the speech that they held a strong ethical predisposition in favor of the speaker. As might be expected, therefore, Gordon

employed ethical proofs to a limited degree in the speech. As a part of his introduction he professed the purity of his motives in appearing in Cincinnati by denying that he had any interest in local issues or state candidates. He was present, he said, to make an appeal against a long-standing effort on the part of some to "build up a barrier between the fellow-citizens of a common country." He pledged: "If I fail to deal with you honestly, candidly, frankly, may my tongue be palsied within my mouth." During the argument in which he proclaimed the loyalty and sincerity of the South, Gordon described his recent experiences at Philadelphia as a part of a G. A. R. reunion in which "I felt from the crown of my head to the soles of my feet the thrill which I knew was pulsating in the veins of the remnants of the Grand Army of the Republic." Attempting now to establish his patriotism, Gordon modestly allowed himself to quote some comments on his speech at Macon:

My utterances may not be worth much, but as my countrymen are good enough to vote for me sometimes I may venture to quote from myself. My modesty will not allow me to read all, but I will read one sentence from the editorial. The paper says: "It is a perfect expression of the sentiment of the South as regards the war and the Union."

He likewise quoted sections of speeches he had made at Montgomery and Augusta which illustrated that he had been a consistent advocate of reunion. Continuing in this vein, Gordon stated:

A few years ago I stood in a great hall in the great capital of the French Republic. There. . . I uttered the same thought and endeavored to impress upon the divided, embittered people of France to imitate the example of the reunited people.

There were Gordon's only specific references at Cincinnati to his own motives and abilities.

An examination of the Columbus and Cleveland speeches reveals a much heavier reliance upon ethical appeals. At both cities, where he was under heavy attack from the Republican newspapers, he made lengthy ethical references, proclaiming that his life "could stand the strictest scrutiny," and quoting from his speech to his troops at Appomattox in April, 1865, in which he told them that "the war is over, the Union, the country, and the old flag are restored, and President Lincoln is sustained." He also quoted from H. M. Turner, Negro churchman, what might almost be termed a character reference.

Gordon's use of ethical proof should be noted another speech, his "Confederacy" lecture, where he pictured himself in passing as a brave leader, but always moved by humanitarian instincts in regard to his own men and to the enemy. His Boston and Gettysburg speeches contain almost no personal references.

It may be concluded from these examples that he was capable of using effective ethical appeals when the situation merited it, especially during his Ohio tour, but that ethical proof did not form a consistent part of his pattern of discourse.

Emotional appeals

Being a seasoned speaker of some oratorical reputation, Gordon did not fail to capitalize on the favorable situation in which he found himself. At Cincinnati he made his first major attempt to stir the emotions of his listeners by referring to their desire for the preservation of revered social institutions. This was followed by a presentation of his logical arguments on why the South should love the Union and do everything possible to solidify it. In doing this he made use of

the "dramatic trio," casting himself as hero, the bloody shirt wavers as villains, and the Union (of which the Ohioans were described as being a prominent part) as the heroine. As hero he attacked the radical villains who he said were the real enemies of the Union because they would not let old animosities die and were unwilling to allow the South once again to take her rightful place in the Union.

During the course of his argument on why the South should love the Union, Gordon appealed to the acquisitive instinct of his audience in explaining that the South seceded because she realized that to remain would mean the eventual loss of millions of dollars in property. He expressed this argument as follows:

It was an act, as we thought, of self-preservation, under the first laws of nature--self-protection--that is what we thought; and I repeat it does not make any difference whether we fought right or fought wrong. Not a bit. All I am after is the motive that impelled it.

We feared we were going to lose some property by staying in, and did lose it by going out.

As a preliminary to his third main point, the honesty and integrity of the South, Gordon appealed to the "reasoning" Republicans who might hear or read his speech by praising them as follows:

I put it to you, sensible Republicans, now: there is many a one of you that has been misguided about this thing. You are patriots; you are just men. I never have had in this heart of mine one solitary thought of bitterness toward any Republican of the North who was honest in his convictions... .

With this brief introduction, he now presented the point itself, employing a notable collection of emotionally "loaded" words in describing Southern endorsement of the belief that secession was legal. The South believed so fiercely, he said, that the Confederates gave "all our courage, all our faith, all our talent, all our wealth, our blood, our prayers, our churches, our manhood and womanhood."

After a discussion of differing interpretations of the Constitution, Gordon now turned to the most emotional major point in his speech, concerning continued Southern affinity for Jefferson Davis and the symbols of the Confederacy. It was based on an appreciation of honor and integrity which he assumed that his audience possessed. Referring to the much-publicized meeting the previous week in Macon, Georgia, in which Jeff Davis was wildly cheered, Gordon stated:

My countrymen, if we would turn our backs on Jefferson Davis, and refuse him our sympathy, we would merit the contempt and scorn of every brave man in this audience. When Jefferson Davis left the United States Senate he was a rich man and full of political honors. For our sakes he became poor, impoverished, imprisoned and debarred forever from all the political honors of his country. He left it in the full strength and prime of manhood. He lingers today on the verge of the grave with broken health, with bent limb, with increasing and unabating suffering, dragging after him the limb which was shattered at Buena Vista. . . . What would you think of our people if we should say to him: "Go hence, you are broken in health, you have lost your power, and we can use you no more." We will not be guilty of base and cowardly ingratitude.

Turning to the salutation given the Confederate flags carried in the Macon parade, Gordon continued to appeal to his audience's sense of honor, again using emotionally connotative language:

I should have no hope for liberty in America if those men had not loved those flags and cheered them. . . . Let us be honest. Let us be just. Let us rise above passion. Let us lift for one hour the politics of this country above the slime and mire, above the low plane where hatred of the South is the synonym of loyalty to the North. . . . That man honors himself who honors the brave. He is a better patriot, a better defender of liberty, who has the courage to do justice, whatever it costs. Was there disloyalty in our cheers to our battle-flags. They were woven, made by tender hands of patriotic Southern women. They were delivered to sons, husbands and brothers bathed in tears and consecrated by the prayers of wives, sisters and daughters.

After stating that the essential spirit at Macon, as at similar meetings at Montgomery and Augusta, was reconciliatory and not rebellious, Gordon began the refutative section of his speech, on the Southern treatment of the Negro. Most of this section was based on logical reasoning, but he introduced it with an emotionalized account of a recent deathbed scene involving the venerable Negress who had cared for four generations of Gordon's family. In the final subdivision of this argument, the Negro and the ballot, he discussed first why the Southerners had initially opposed the Negro vote. Gordon again employed the dramatic trio, this time casting the Negro as the heroine, while the carpetbaggers were the villains and the Southern Democrats the hero. He described the unwelcome visitors as "adventurers" who came into the South and herded the Negroes to the polls, usurping all the state offices and robbing the people of tax funds. This situation had to be altered, he said, and the Southern whites took matters into their own hands and successfully corrected it. Continuing his attempt to create indignation and contempt toward the carpetbaggers, he described them as "singular human beings, like the wind in one sense, as the Bible says: You heard their sound, and no one knew from whence they came or where they went." Concluding his attack, Gordon charged:

They were not of the brave fellows who followed the Union flag; they were campfollowers; they were the vultures following in the wake of victorious legions, and bearing off on their polluted wings the spoils of battle, fattening on the blood of the soldier.

Gordon now turned to his final major point, his desire to promote peace and good will. Much of this argument was developed emotionally through his attempts to arouse indignation against the bloody shirt politicians:

Liberty in a Government like ours must live, if it lives at all, in the intelligence and virtue and cooperation of all the people. How are you going to perpetuate cooperation for the future generation if you teach your children that the children of the southern country are unworthy of cooperation or confidence. This thing is so far-reaching that the plummet has never been made long enough to sound the depth of the infamy of the men who would perpetuate these animosities. . . .

I had rather be Grant, dead and buried, lying cold and lifeless in his coffin, with his grave mildewed by the tears of all his countrymen, than to be the living, active triumphant agent of such a passion as is sought to be perpetuated here.

Continuing in the same theme, Gordon invoked the spirit of Grant and attempted to shame his listeners into accepting his views:

What do you think he would say to the men who are seeking to put the blush to the spirit in which he died, manifesting to his countrymen with almost his last words, as his eyes turned for the last time to look at his country, he exclaimed, "Thank God, the country is at last united." He died believing it. He died feeling that passion at last was gone, and, my countrymen, it is gone in all that section of this land from which I come.

I thought it was gone here in Ohio, but it seems not. Oh, my friends, what are you going to do next November? Whether you vote for one man or another—I don't intend to mention any names here—let me beg of you, for the interest of posterity, your children and mine, for the interest of this great Government, for the interest of this Union in which we are all interested, for the interest of liberty, rise in your might and, by the inexorable fiat of a mighty public opinion, frown down forever the spirit which I have been discussing tonight.

This speech to the Cincinnati Democrats is representative of emotional proofs employed in most of Gordon's other reconciliatory speeches. He relied rather heavily on pathetic and ethical appeals, especially praise of his audience. He appealed to the acquisitive instincts of his audience by explaining why the Southerners desired to protect their property. One of the major divisions of the speech was based on an appeal to the appreciation of his audience for the traits of honesty, loyalty, and integrity. Gordon did his best to

arouse indignation and contempt in his audience, first against the carpetbaggers and then against those politicians who capitalized on a spirit of disunion. He concluded by evoking the spirit of General Grant toward reunion and then attempting to shame his listeners into accepting his views on reunion. Special emotional devices included the dramatic trio, in which he became the hero, his enemies the villain, and the Union or the people the heroine.

On occasions when it appeared fitting Gordon employed humor to a rather limited degree. Particularly in his "Confederacy" lecture are humorous references to be found, all of them allegedly factual events of the war. One involved the payment for some horses "requisitioned" by Gordon in Pennsylvania with a draft allegedly signed by Abraham Lincoln. Another concerned an incident when the rival armies were encamped on opposite banks of the Rapidan River. This event, Gordon said, illustrated the spirit of the enemy soldiers toward one another. A Union soldier had swum the river and was visiting the Confederate soldiers when they were surprised by Gordon, who demanded that the Federal be arrested. The Rebels remonstrated and the Union soldier explained his presence by saying: "I know we are having a war, but we are not fighting now." The lecture contained other humorous anecdotes about the eccentricities of several of the Confederate officers. In his Cincinnati speech, Gordon evoked laughter a few times with ironical attacks on carpetbaggers and Radical Republicans, but generally speaking he employed humor to a limited degree in his reconciliatory oratory.

Accuracy

Gordon was careful in his reconciliation addresses to supply specific details and provide names whenever possible. At Cincinnati, for example, he carefully defined the natural boundaries of the Louisiana purchase. He described how every state except Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, and the New England states came into the Union under Southern executives or the territory thereof was contributed by Southern states. California, he said, was acquired under the Polk administration and Scott and Taylor led the U. S. armies to Mexico. Concerning the progress of the Negroes, he compared their welfare under the carpetbag governments with that under white rule, using such unrounded figures as "813,725 acres," "\$21,186," and "42,384 persons." The specific quality of the language might be somewhat boring to modern listeners, though the argumentative nature of the occasion certainly justified bringing to bear all the concrete information possible. In his other speeches, Gordon was almost as meticulous in stating names, dates, and occasions. This was particularly true in his "Confederacy" lecture, where he named towns along the line of march and recalled the names of large numbers of officers involved in the various campaigns. Employment of verbs, however, was not so precise. For example, Gordon told his Cincinnati audience: "I have come here to talk to you tonight." "Let us look at the situation." "I want to get close to you; to look you in the eye." "Let us come to the truth." "Was it because we did not like this Union?" "How did we get the Constitution?" "I put it to you." "We tried to go out of the Union." "Well, we went out." "He became poor." "These people were in slavery." "I want hatred to die."

"The rich can get along." The total effect of Gordon's use of rather exact connotative nouns with weak and general verbs and adverbs is to create a feeling of incongruity which may detract somewhat from the accuracy of the style.

Force

A random sampling of words employed in Gordon's Cincinnati speech reveals that a preponderance of words of one and two syllables were used. Multisyllabled words included "preservation," "institution," "Constitution," "Disloyalty," "utterances," "Republicans," and "philosophy." Speeches delivered in Columbus and Cleveland are likewise marked by the shortness of words. Though the "Confederacy" lecture employed longer and generally less familiar terms than did Gordon's campaign speeches or his Boston address, he was usually careful to make the meaning apparent by means of context. In justifying a Civil War raid into Pennsylvania, he stated: "Social reciprocity demanded it," and then explained that "we owed our Northern cousins a large number of visits." Explaining that Gettysburg and Appomattox were the most significant points in Southern military history, Gordon commented:

At Gettysburg its sun reached the zenith, and passed the meridian; at Appomattox it went down forever. Gettysburg, therefore, is the turning point . . . between the aspiring and the expiring Confederate States of America.

The shortness and easy intelligibility of most of Gordon's words probably combined with his tendency to employ short, simple sentences in producing a rather staccato quality. The majority of sentences examined were fifteen words or less in length, with the longest running to not more than fifty-five words. In keeping with this relatively limited sentence length, most of the sentences are simple in

construction. A small number of compound sentences were discovered, as well as a still smaller total of complex and compound-complex sentences. For the most part, Gordon's statements were direct to the point of bluntness. This effect is softened somewhat by a tendency for the speaker to repeat himself. Referring to the charge that the South had to be defeated to keep her in the Union, Gordon cautioned:

Let us analyse it. Let us be frank now with each other. Let us invite the light of the lightning's flash. Let the bolt fall where it may. Let us come to the truth.

He spoke of secession next, saying: "We went out, that is enough for me. . . . Well, we tried to go out, and for that reason you ought to think us pretty honest." Justifying tribute to Jefferson Davis, he urged: "My countrymen, be honest. Take it home to your own hearts. Put yourselves in the South's place." Of slavery, he noted: "The Negroes knew if the South was defeated they would be free. They wanted to be free; no doubt about that. They longed for their freedom." "Why should we not be friends?" he demanded. "Why shan't we be friends?" This repetitive tendency was coupled with a parallelism which ran through most of the speech, linking it together almost sentence by sentence. This technique is illustrated in the following paragraph:

Why shouldn't the South love this Union? Didn't she help to form it? Didn't she aid at its birth? Didn't her fathers stand with your fathers. . . . Didn't old Virginia surrender the very territory out of which was formed this magnificent Commonwealth in which we to-day stand? And didn't she contribute the territory out of which was formed and organized the surroundings of this great belt? Didn't Georgia . . . contribute to the territory of this Union from her western border the entire domain to the Mississippi River?

The technique is likewise evident in the passage cited above concerning the charge that the South had to be "whipped" to keep her in the Union,

Other instances of parallel construction are more graceful. To the Boston Commercial Club Gordon announced: "We have water power unexcelled. . . . We have a climate most balmy and genial and healthful. We have rich mines of coal and iron." At Gettysburg he declared his wishes concerning the subject matter of his speech: "I would speak of all these: of the motives which impelled each, of the swaying tides of the three days battle, of the final Federal victory, and of its preponderating influences. . . ." Gordon's parallelism was at times apparently effective; more frequently it may have been distractingly repetitious because of its obviousness. Concerning the general forcefulness of his style, it may be said that he possibly marred a direct, incisive quality through redundancy and a parallelism which was frequently somewhat graceless.

Suggestiveness

Gordon used a number of similies and metaphorical statements as a part of his Cincinnati speech. In attempting to explain the Southern attitude toward the mistreatment of slaves, the speaker stated: "It was as inexorable as the law of the Medes and Persians that the man who treated his slaves unkindly was debarred from decent society." Stating that he was once opposed to the Negro vote, Gordon maintained that "adventurers came into our midst and marshaled these men, herded them like cattle, carried them to the polls with arms in their hands. . . ." These same carpetbaggers were the subject of two more figurative comparisons:

They were like the wind in one sense, as the Bible says: You heard their sound, and no man knew from whence they came or where they went. I had sometimes thought they were like Mr. Lincoln's mule, without the pride of ancestry, and for the sake of my country, I could wish that they were like the mule in another sense--without the hope of posterity.

A metaphorical quotation concerned the Northern attitude toward secession: "The North was impressed by that declaration of its greatest leader, Daniel Webster, that dissolution of the Union was the destruction of liberty." Another passage which involved personification and metaphor was used in Gordon's Gettysburg address, when he spoke for the Confederate veterans: "They join in consecrating for annual patriotic pilgrimage these historic heights, which drank such copious draughts of American blood poured so freely in discharge of duty as each conceived it, a Mecca for the North which so grandly defended it, and a Mecca for the South which so bravely and persistently stormed it." Gordon's scathing denunciation of carpetbaggers contained a metaphorical barb: "They were the vultures following in the wake of victorious legions, and bearing off on their polluted wings the spoils of battle, fattening on the blood of the soldier."

The speaker did not hesitate to employ terms which probably had a strong association with emotional reactions, nor to utilize epithet and invective against his enemies. He used terms such as "lovers of liberty," "misguided Republicans," "our wealth, our blood, our prayers, our churches, our manhood and our womanhood," "prostrated and bleeding South," "religious liberty," "the Union, cemented in blood," "heroic Southern women," "the slime and mire of partisan politics," "reddened with the blood of the brave," "singular human beings," and "vultures . . . fattening on the blood of the soldier." In summary, Gordon gained suggestiveness in his language through use of figures of speech and connotative words and phrases.

Ease

Direct address was the principal technique by which Gordon strove to achieve ease in his style. In the introduction to his Cincinnati speech he rejected several salutations as being "too cold and formal," finally deciding on "my friends." Having made this choice, he did not use it again during the speech, but talked to his listeners as "fellow-countrymen," a term repeated at least twenty times. "You" was used with great frequency, and on a number of points he carried the problem to his listeners with demands like "What would you do?" or "How would you have reacted?" The listeners were also drawn into the discourse by comments such as "I am showing you that we were honest in our convictions," "If you do not agree with me, you will before I get through," and "Put yourself in the South's place." He likewise used a few idiomatic words and expressions, saying that the South had to be "whipped" to be kept in the Union, and referring a number of times to "carpetbaggers." Confederates were frequently called "Johnnies." The compelling directness and informality of language employed by Gordon probably gave his style a noteworthy ease.

Summary

Gordon was meticulous in his use of nouns, but verbs and adverbs frequently lacked color and conciseness. The meaning of words and sentences was readily intelligible but a fondness for repetition and use of parallel construction may have counteracted the force of his language. The speaker achieved a degree of suggestiveness through figures of speech and connotative language. His style was notable for its ease of expression, achieved through direct address, attempts to

relate the audience to the discourse, and idiomatic language.

Henry Watterson

The most prolific of the Southern reconciliation orators was Henry Watterson of Louisville, Kentucky, who delivered no less than twelve reunion messages as defined in this study. The son of a Tennessee Congressman, Watterson spent much of his childhood in Washington, D. C. He had already begun work as a newspaper reporter in 1861, when he enlisted in the Confederate army immediately after reaching his twentieth birthday. In 1862 he left the army to become editor of the Rebel, a Confederate newspaper published in Chattanooga. After the fall of that city in 1863 he returned to the army, where he served until the end of the war. With the return of peace, he resumed journalistic pursuits, first with the Nashville Republican Banner and then as publisher of the Louisville Journal, which he merged in 1868 with the Louisville Courier.

Though not an office-seeker, he was very active in politics throughout his life, generally as a conservative. He urged a policy of reconciliation after the war and "was for years the one conspicuous Southern man having anti-sectional sympathies and the courage to maintain them." He was popular as a writer as well as being greatly in demand as a speaker.¹ In addition to publishing in pamphlet form his lecture on Abraham Lincoln, he included three of his best-known reconciliation speeches, "Puritan and Cavalier," "The Reunited Sections," and "God's Promise Redeemed," in his autobiography.² According to

¹National Cyclopedia of American Biography, op. cit., I, 468f.

²The Compromises of Life (New York: Duffield and Co., 1906).

one historian's appraisal of him,

Watterson was fortunate in his time and place. He became prominent in the dark days of Reconstruction, when as the chief editor of a loyal border state he could interpret each section to the other. He also had a gift for practical politics and . . . was one of the rather incalculable leaders of the Democratic party. . . . In his reminiscences he could justly boast that he had striven not merely for reconciliation between North and South, but to make the South respect the rights of the Negro, and face honestly the duties of the new era opened by emancipation.¹

As early as 1869 the editorial policy of the Courier-Journal began to urge that the righteousness of the war and attendant issues be abandoned in the public interest in favor of more pressing practical problems. Watterson admonished his readers in Kentucky and Tennessee that Confederate military service should be the sole test of fitness no longer and counseled that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments be accepted with the best grace possible. These editorials urging the "new departure" stirred up a sizeable controversy but won him considerable following in the state.² Harry Hewitt Benn supplies the following description of Watterson's position as a reconciliation speaker:

He is before all else a Nationalist, and on many National occasions has spoken out of a sympathy so broad and catholic as to disarm partisan criticism and to make himself for the time being a representative of all parties. This was notably the case at the formal opening of the World's Fair at Chicago, where he was the orator of the day, and on the occasion of the first meeting of the Grand Army of the Republic on Southern soil, where he delivered the speech of welcome. His addresses, such as at the dinner of the New England Society of the City of New York, in 1895 [actually 1894] show him to be a man wholly without sectional prejudices, but of the most reverent devotion to the restored

¹Allan Nevins, American Press Opinion, Washington to Coolidge (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1928), p. 303f.

²Coulter, op. cit., p. 435f.

Union, though he made an honorable record as a soldier of the Confederacy during the war of secession.¹

Audiences and Occasions of Watterson's Reunion Speaking

Having attracted some national attention by his editorial advocacy of the "New Departure" in South-North relations, Watterson received his first opportunity to express his views from the platform in an invitation to deliver the address on Decoration Day, 1877, at the National Cemetery near Nashville. In his letter of acceptance, Watterson wrote:

I feel that the American soldier who gave up his life for his opinion was my comrade, no matter where he fought, and I know that the fame and honor of every brave soldier is dear to me. I shall bring to the performance of this duty at least a national spirit, proud of the achievements of the whole people on the battlefield, and happy in a peace that joins all the people in a lasting union of free states.²

Several pieces of evidence are available concerning Watterson's delivery. To one observer, "Mr. Watterson is an easy, graceful, pleasant speaker, using no notes, and making himself at once at home on the platform, and immediately ingratiating himself with his hearers."³ Another commented:

Mr. Watterson is a man of medium stature, slender build, and of prepossessing appearance. He is a sprightly, entertaining talker, easy, graceful and at home on the platform. A peculiar, though not displeasing mannerism, is his gestures.⁴

Still another comment gave this picture of Watterson on the platform:

¹New York Times Magazine, XXX (October 24, 1897), 2.

²New York Times, May 2, 1877, p. 5.

³New York Times, November 21, 1877, p. 4.

⁴Dayton Daily Journal, June 5, 1878, p. 3.

Mr. Watterson spoke with deliberation, pausing at the strong points to allow them to impress his hearers. The manuscript of his lecture [the Lincoln lecture] lay before him, but he seldom referred to it except when he read letters or extracts of speeches, and then he put on his spectacles.¹

These comments may aid in picturing the speaker as he stood before a crowd of several thousand persons on an open-air platform in the National Cemetery at Nashville for his first reunion speech. He professed an absence of sectional spirit, declaring that he had relinquished loyalty to the Confederacy at Appomattox. He attributed the war to a constitutional flaw which resulted in excusable misunderstanding. The peace terms were described as the most magnanimous in history. Renouncing any desire to discuss politics, he made a direct appeal for friendliness between the sections. His address was greeted with "dignified enthusiasm."²

Watterson had a lecture, "Comicalities, Whimsicalities and Realities of Southern Life," which he developed for use in the South, but which, as his fame spread, he delivered several times in the North as well. The lecture basically was a description of life in the ante-bellum South, but on occasion Watterson injected a section relating to current political and economic problems in the South which was definitely conciliatory in nature. One such occasion was his appearance at Dayton, Ohio, on June 4, 1878, where the local Republican paper gave this account:

The lecture was delivered to a small but appreciative audience. Captain Wood in a few neat and appropriate words introduced the speaker.

¹Chicago Tribune, February 13, 1895, p. 1.

²New York Herald, May 31, 1877, p. 1.

The lecturer made a few general remarks on wit and humor, stating that it is always dependant upon the manners, customs and habits of thought of a people--that what he intended to give was a description of the South in the past, rather than as it is of the present. . . . The account of the change in the habits of the South, interspersed with anecdote and witticism, was interesting. The South had been misunderstood and misinterpreted. There has been much of lawlessness, but the conservative force will prevail over violence. He paid a high tribute to the noble womanhood of the South.¹

Watterson was well received at Dayton. As it was his first visit to the city, the local officials showed him the points of interest, particularly the Union Soldiers' Home, where he made a speech in the afternoon. The Journal carried a description of the affair:

Governor Brown had been appraised of their coming, and received them cordially at the headquarters. The Home Band had been assembled on the Campus Martius, and filled the air with music. Under the escort of the governor and his staff, Mr. Watterson visited the library, and conservatory, the hospital and other objects of interest about the ground. The bugle had been sounded and residents gathered about the band stand to the number of a thousand or more, desirous of hearing the address of this well-known gentleman.

It was an occasion of more especial interest from the fact that Mr. Watterson had been a soldier in the Confederate army during the war. Mr. Watterson was introduced by Hon. George W. Honk for a few remarks, referring to him as a gentleman known to all present from his prominence in the political history of the time, as one of the talented members of the press, and a soldier who fought on the other side during the late unpleasantness, but whose presence served as a reminder that these times were now of the past.

The address was listened to with much attention by the audience, and its sentiments frequently applauded. At the

¹Dayton Daily Journal, June 5, 1878, p. 3. By contrast this lecture as delivered in Chicago on March 3, 1892, contained no section about the misunderstanding and misrepresentation of the South or the triumph of conservative forces, according to the Chicago Tribune, March 4, 1892, p. 4. Neither was the conciliatory passage present in New York City at the delivery of the speech November 20, 1877, according to the New York Times, November 21, 1877, p. 4.

close the party returned to Dayton, arriving in the city in time to allow Mr. Watterson to rest himself before lecturing in the evening.

Watterson stated frankly that he and his listeners had been enemies who fought one another with great bravery. He expressed the desire for a proved program of veterans' benefits, and stated that they should be extended to Southern veterans as well. He expressed his feeling of composure at being among the Union veterans and proclaimed his happiness at the end of the war.¹

During the subsequent five years Watterson became interested in the economic opportunities of the South,² and it was not surprising in view of the prestige which he had established as politician, lecturer, and journalist, that he should be chosen to deliver the principal address to the American Bankers Convention in Louisville. Seldom had a reconciliation speaker had the opportunity to address a more powerful and influential group. It was composed of about 150 Eastern, Western, and Southern members, including Senator Hawley of Connecticut; John Jay Knox, Comptroller of the Currency; and Governors Crittenden of Missouri, Knott of Kentucky, Murray of Utah, Jarvis of North Carolina, and Porter of Indiana.³

Watterson's speech followed the discussion of Southern affairs on the second day of the convention. Speeches had been made by representatives of Texas, Georgia, Virginia, Alabama, and Arkansas predicting increased prosperity for their respective states, so that Watterson occupied a summary position in the proceedings. After some humorous comments on his sentiments in the presence of so many bankers,

¹Ibid.

²Cf. editorials in the Louisville Courier-Journal, July and August, 1881; July to December, 1883.

³New York Times, October 12, 1883, p. 5.

he discussed the economic folly of slavery, the firmer economic basis which economic diversity had brought, and discussed at length the South's need for capital investment and loans at a reduced interest rate. The South, he said, had now become a stable political area and a safe field for investment.¹ "He was listened to with the closest attention and the association generally applauded."²

In 1890, less than a year after Henry Grady's appearance at the Boston Merchants Club, Watterson received an invitation to address the same group on an identical topic, the race problem. The agitation of the previous year by Henry Cabot Lodge and others in the Congress for federal supervision of polling places in the South to guarantee the Negro vote was by no means forgotten. Leaders of the "force bill" agitation were Senator George F. Hoar and Speaker of the House Samuel Reed. Against a background of charges and counter-charges concerning the political rights of the Southern Negro, Watterson faced the merchants at the Hotel Vendome on October 4, 1890. He advanced the thesis that in reality the Northern and Southern attitudes toward racial segregation were identical. Segregation was as stringent in Boston as in Charleston, he alleged, but Southern segregation was more logical because Southern Negroes were semi-illiterate ex-slaves, while Massachusetts Negroes were more likely to be intelligent and educated. In the "black belt," he further asserted, the colored men knew nothing about the significance of the ballot, and given the opportunity to vote, they were a terrible force. The Solid South was produced, he

¹Louisville Courier-Journal, October 11, 1883, p. 3.

²New York Times, October 12, 1883, p. 5.

said, by pressure from without for Negro suffrage and by Southern fears that outside action would interfere with Southern business.¹

An indication of the prominence which Watterson had reached was his invitation two years later to deliver the dedicatory address at the opening of the Chicago World's Fair on October 21, 1892. The lengthy opening exercises were held in the great Arts Building, with an estimated 100,000 people present. Watterson spoke near the end of the program when the vast audience, many of whom could not hear what was happening on the platform, was becoming increasingly restless. Not all of his speech was devoted to reunion sentiments, but a sizeable portion discussed slavery, the war, and reconstruction. He expressed confidence in the strength of the Constitution, which had withstood the strain of the war, reconstruction, an impeachment trial, and a disputed election. Slavery had happily disappeared, along with the "mirage of the Confederacy," and the Union was now on solid ground because a double construction of the Constitution was no longer possible.²

On December 22, 1886, Henry W. Grady had delivered his memorable "New South" speech before the New England Society in the City of New York and had been roundly criticized by Watterson for the open wooing of Northern capital, on the grounds that Northern industrialists would seize complete control of Southern industry and "the best blood of the South will feed the factories which grind out squalor to millions and millions."³ Eight years later, on December 22, 1894, Watterson became

¹"Mr. Watterson's Speech," Harper's Weekly, XXXIV (October 11, 1890), 787.

²New York Times, October 22, 1892, p. 8.

³Ibid., December 23, 1894, p. 3.

the second Southerner to address this influential group. The eighty-ninth annual meeting was held at Sherry's with about 375 members and guests present. Grady had made reference to the Puritan-Cavalier distinction between North and South, and it was this which Watterson took as his theme:

His eloquent remarks, following the line of thought which made the speech of Henry W. Grady a memorable event in the annals of the society, were received with round after round of applause, and repeated cheers. Throughout its delivery he met with hearty response to his beautifully expressed sentiments and neatly turned references to the "Cavaliers of the North and the Puritans of the South."

Watterson made a lengthy reference to his Southern predecessor, whom he described as a "student" and "protege" of his. As a "third-party" Scotch-Irishman, Watterson said he felt eligible to comment on the foibles of both Puritan and Cavalier, but he systematically discarded the time-honored distinction by which Northerners and Southerners were separated, concluding that all had now become Americans.¹

In keeping with his general policy of reconciliation, Watterson was desirous of persuading the Grand Army to hold a national convention in Louisville. To this end he visited the national encampment in Pittsburgh in 1894 and on September 11 appeared on the platform at Old City Hall with Governor William McKinley of Ohio, General Sickles, and several other less distinguished guests. Speaking last on the program, the Kentuckian expressed sadness that the war had come, but said he rejoiced that it had ended as it did and hoped that the G. A. R. would visit Louisville in 1895 as an indication that hostile feeling was at an end. His brief speech was greeted with "cheers and applause."²

¹Ibid.

²Pittsburgh Commercial Gazette, September 12, 1894, p. 1.

An evening meeting was held at Carnegie Hall in Allegheny, a community in North Pittsburgh. Again Watterson was present together with Governors Pattison of Pennsylvania and McKinley of Ohio. The auditorium was jammed with "several hundred" spectators who stood in every available space while many more milled around outside. Here Watterson spoke briefly of the reunion of the sections and urged that he be allowed to meet the group on his home ground in Louisville the following year.¹

Apparently the speeches and negotiations with the veterans were successful, because the invitation was accepted. The New York Times looked with favor on the idea:

The cherished plan of having the veterans of the Blue and Gray meet for once in good fellowship on Southern soil, and together eat of the fruits of peace and good will that have ripened through three decades that have passed since the stirring days of the sixties, is on the eve of realization. . . . A favorite decoration represents a "Boy in Blue and a Boy in Gray" shaking hands and congratulating each other that the war is over and that both stand for a united cause. So far as outward signs are concerned, no greater demonstration of patriotic sentiment could be made, even by a city north of Mason and Dixon's line.²

The veterans arrived and set up their encampment in Louisville September 11, amid a tumultuous welcome from the citizenry. In the address of welcome, Watterson stated that sectional animosity had ended long ago in Kentucky because its people represented both Union and Confederate sentiment which quickly became mingled through close contact. He predicted that nowhere in the South would the visitors find any sign of war, either physical or spiritual. As might be expected, his

¹ Ibid.

² September 9, 1895, p. 8.

address was received with "unbounded enthusiasm."¹

In the meantime, Watterson added another lecture to his repertory. It was his lengthy eulogy of Abraham Lincoln. Following its initial delivery in Chicago on Lincoln's birthday in 1895, it was also presented in Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, May 14 of the same year, and subsequently in Richmond, Charleston, New Orleans, Galveston, and "other Southern cities," and was brought out as a pamphlet in 1899.² Following is an account of its first presentation:

Henry Watterson delivered an eloquent eulogy of Abraham Lincoln before a large audience in the Auditorium last night. It was the eighth public celebration of Lincoln's birthday under the auspices of the Lincoln Council of the National Union. Mr. Watterson's address was the dominant feature of the program but there were numerous musical selections. . . .

Mr. Watterson's lecture was the third number on the program. When he approached the footlights he was greeted with a round of applause. There was no formality of introduction and he began his address without the customary "Ladies and Gentlemen." He quickly caught the interest of his auditors and held it throughout.³

The speech was widely copied and commented upon. One section, in which Watterson stated that Lincoln offered Alexander H. Stephens an opportunity to write his own terms at the Hampton Roads conference if the South would only surrender, brought much adverse criticism, but Watterson consistently refused to alter or delete it, claiming his account was truthful.⁴ At its Brooklyn presentation, "The lecture was delivered precisely as it has been delivered in other localities,

¹Louisville Courier-Journal, September 12, 1895, p. 1.

²Abraham Lincoln (Louisville: Courier-Journal Job Printing Company).

³Chicago Tribune, February 13, 1895, p. 1.

⁴New York Times, May 15, 1895, p. 5.

and the Lincoln-Stephens incident was reiterated by the distinguished Kentucky journalist and emphasized. The lecturer was frequently interrupted by applause."¹

Watterson's eulogy of Union heroes was not limited to Lincoln. On April 27, 1898, he appeared before the Grant Monument Association, gathered for their annual dinner at the Waldorf Dining Room. He told the members that he was sure Grant would look with approval at a Southerner addressing the group, since peace was ever Grant's plea. There were two major errors made by America in the nineteenth century, he asserted: The South had precipitated a war and the North had tolerated Congressional Reconstruction. There could be no doubt as to the reunion of the sections, however, because of the united American reaction in the face of Spanish tyranny in Cuba.²

Watterson's last discovered reconciliatory speech was made at the National Cemetery, Cave Hill, Kentucky, where he delivered the Memorial Day speech. His newspaper described the event as follows:

Through all the years since the close of that momentous conflict which menaced the Union, the thirtieth of May has been set aside for the tribute of homage to the Union dead who perished in the struggle, and yesterday afternoon Cave Hill, in all the beauty which the touch of summer has called into life, was thronged with the thousands who had gathered to pay that tribute. Hundreds of the yet surviving comrades marched in columned ranks to the stand in the Northeast corner of the cemetery in which the memorial services were held. These services were remarkable in that a Southern man, Mr. Henry Watterson, delivered the principal address upon the invitation of the G. A. R. The incident told its own story of a reunited country.³

¹
New York Times, May 15, 1895, p. 5.

²Ibid., April 28, 1898, p. 3.

³Louisville Courier-Journal, May 31, 1899, p. 6.

Watterson described the identical ceremonies which were taking place in both the Union and Confederate sections of the cemetery and said that the men buried there would urge that the ceremonies pay equal tribute to all. As before, he pronounced that the Spanish War had produced a baptism of blood on the new spirit of nationalism.

Analysis of Watterson's Reconciliation Speeches

Henry Watterson was the most prolific of the Southern reunion orators, producing at least twelve speeches on reconciliation, one of which was delivered at least twice in the North. Consequently the selection of one speech as "representative" is extremely difficult. A satisfactory cross-section of his reconciliatory speaking is necessarily composed of at least four speeches: "The Nation's Dead," at the National Cemetery, Nashville, May 30, 1877; "The New South," at the American Bankers Association, Louisville, October 11, 1883; "Let Us Have Peace," at the annual banquet of the Army of the Tennessee, October 9, 1891; and "The Puritan and the Cavalier," before the New England Society, December 22, 1894. These speeches encompass seventeen years and were delivered at a veterans' reunion, a typical "after-dinner" situation, a commercial convention, and a Decoration Day observance.

The first of the speeches, "The Nation's Dead," followed an accepted pattern of occasional oratory. The introduction included a lengthy reference to the occasion, in which the speaker discussed the purpose of the observance, commented on the unusual nature of his presence at a Union observance, and predicted that the day would come when Decoration Day would be an observance for both Union and

Confederate Dead. Coming to the body of the speech, he discussed the "fatal flaw" in the Constitution which gave rise to dissention about states' rights. The problem was so deeply rooted that no tribunal could settle it except appeal to armed force. The terms concluding the conflict, he said, were unique in history. There was no bloody revenge or purge by the victors. Grant and Sherman were supremely reasonable at the moment of victory. Even during the conflict a fine spirit of honor had been maintained. Lee and his soldiers had paid homage to the fallen Kearny and the Union soldiers had honored Morgan at his death. The death of McPherson had been mourned by his Confederate foes. Contrary to the opinion held in the North, Watterson averred, Lincoln's assassination had convulsed the South with sorrow. The speaker concluded from this evidence and his observation that the people of the North and South had always been basically united, despite their tragic political division. Religion was one of the strongest common elements, he felt.

Turning to the situation in 1877, Watterson denounced the "fruitless party conflict" which was needlessly preventing a wholehearted reconciliation of the sections. The people could take a cue from the dead buried nearby, he said. Unmoved by petty passions, they asked nothing and refused to pass judgment on the merits of the conflict. The speaker now made a direct personal appeal for friendliness, urging his listeners to abandon the idea of sectionalism and partisan politics and become real friends. In concluding, he expressed thanks for the opportunity of appearing, pledged a new allegiance to the flag, and called upon God to bless the country.¹

¹Watterson, op. cit., pp. 276-287.

By contrast, his speech to the bankers, "The New South," was humorous, unadorned, and direct. The introduction was light and humorous, involving an expression of his awe at catching practically the entire banking profession "on the wing" and a speculation that the combined millions represented could probably corner the national debt. Noting that he had come to talk about the South rather than abstract finance, Watterson arrived at the body of the speech. While the South had always been a potentially prosperous area, he said, the "curse of slavery" had prevented the fullest development of her resources. Southern manhood, while essentially capable, had dissipated itself on trifles. Having had its false economy and social structure shattered, the South had now gone to work in earnest and become richer in soul if not in material wealth. With this new and healthy attitude, Watterson said, the South had become a fertile field for investment of Northern capital. Louisville was an example of what could be done without Northern help, and the orator speculated that with enough capital, the success could be repeated throughout the South. If aid were refused, he said, the area would be developed, but with far less speed. Watterson now argued that the South was as safe an area for investment as the West and deserved the same low interest rates as prevailed elsewhere. With the end of war and the coming of peace, political stability and law and order were as prevalent in the South as New England. He concluded the speech by proclaiming that the people of the nation were naturally homogeneous despite political differences.¹

The third speech cited for consideration, "Let Us Have Peace,"

¹Ibid., pp. 288-93.

began with an assurance by the speaker that he felt perfectly at home among the Union veterans. The sections were closer together than at any time since the adoption of the federal constitution, he said, otherwise an invitation would not have been extended to him. He expressed gratitude that Union marksmanship did not single him out during the fighting. The nation must accept the fact that the war was happily ended and the people reunited. A Union victory was necessary for the greatest good to the country. The conflict had arisen, he said, from a defect in the framing of the Constitution. The guilt for slavery had initially been shared by both sections, but the North had been first to realize that it was economically unsound. The greatest guarantee that the Negroes were being well treated, he asserted was that the South depended upon them to do most of the vital labor of the section.

Watterson now made reference to the occasion, which honored the memory of Grant. The speaker noted that he had been intensely interested in Grant's career. He had avoided an acquaintance during the "confused and unhappy period" of Grant's political activity. Later they had met in Kentucky and Watterson had found the ex-president "the embodiment of simplicity and integrity." Grant was described as a heroic figure in his attempts to finish his memoirs before death overtook him. The surest sign that the country was moving toward reunion, Watterson said, was after his return from Grant's funeral. His wife, whose father had died in the Confederate cause, arranged all the clippings and mementos of the funeral into a display. The speech had no formal conclusion.¹

¹Ibid., pp. 294-99.

"The Puritan and the Cavalier" took as its point of departure the visit of Henry Grady to the New England Society. Grady had been his protege, Watterson said, and he was justly proud of the "boy." Grady had dreamed from his childhood of being a peacemaker and his ambition had been gloriously fulfilled. Watterson intended to take up where Grady had left off, he said, with the Puritan-Cavalier theme. Since he was not a member of either group, he could speak from a position of Scotch-Irish detachment. Though acknowledging that the Puritan-Cavalier division may once have existed, he proclaimed that the distinction had now disappeared. Even when it was in force, many Southern leaders were Puritans and many Yankees were Cavaliers. Webster had all the vices signalized by the Cavalier; Calhoun all the virtues of the Puritan. The Scotch-Irish, Watterson said, supplied the missing link of adaptivity needed by both elements. After generations of interbreeding, Lincoln emerged as a flowering of Puritan and Cavalier, at the pinnacle of Americanism. In closing, Watterson urged that the dead past be forgotten, complete with memories of witchcraft and slavery.¹

These four speeches, as well as his other addresses, begin with lengthy references to the occasion. Some of the references, as at Chicago to the Army of the Tennessee and at Louisville to the bankers, were of a humorous nature. No one thesis is evident at the Chicago Army reunion speech or at the Nashville address, the former containing two clear-cut divisions, on the war and its causes and on the greatness of Grant; the latter being concerned with the causes of the war, the

¹Reed, op. cit., III, 1191.

terms of peace, and the significance of Decoration Day. At the New England Society, Watterson developed the single thesis that Puritan and Cavalier had blended into a new race, the American. Before the bankers at Louisville, Watterson concentrated on demonstrating that the South was a safe and needy field for investment. The Nashville and New York speeches shared a common concluding theme, a forward look at the peaceful, united country. Watterson ended his talk to the bankers with a summary of arguments on the advantages of Southern investment, and in concluding his Decoration Day addresses referred once again to the occasion. No consistent pattern of arrangement of proofs in the four speeches is evident.

The subdivisions of the New England speech are carefully integrated, following one another in a logical pattern, as is true in the address at Louisville. In the latter, Watterson developed his subject by explaining the unsound financial and commercial basis of slaveholding, discussing the needs and opportunities for Southern investment, and concluding with an analysis of Southern political conditions which indicated that the South was as safe for investment as any other section. Watterson's speech in the Nashville Cemetery is the most loosely arranged, with references to the occasion, discussions of the cause and results of the war, and current political issues interspersed according to no observable pattern. A generalization concerning speech arrangement is that he was far from meticulous, sometimes employing a formal conclusion and sometimes omitting it, though using an introduction in each case. He was not consistent in stating a thesis and frequently mixed his ideas according to no apparent pattern.

Modes of Proof

Logical proof

Reasoning from general propositions.--General propositions formed a limited part of Watterson's logical proof. His speech at the Federal Cemetery in Nashville contains five notable general propositions. The first concerned a feeling of nationalism: "There is no one of us, wore he the one cloth or the other, come he from the granite hills of New England or the orange groves of the sunny South, who has not an interest for himself and for his children in the preservation and perpetuation of Free America." The second lauded the characteristics of the American people: "The most obstinate of partisans, the most untraveled of provincials, cannot efface or obscure, still less dispute, the story of heroism in war, of moderation in peace, which written in letters of vestal fire, will blaze forever upon our national tablets." The third defended the motives of the South: "The old feudal ideas of treason do not belong to our institutions or our epoch. Our future is to be secured by generous concessions, for ours was a war of mistakes, not of disgraces." Later in the speech, he set the stage for a discussion of the terms of peace with the generalization that "the world has never seen terms so liberal extended to soldiers beaten in civil broil; or known such abstinence from sanguinary revenges during the progress of the strife." Preparing to praise the outcome of the war, Watterson proclaimed: "The war is over, and it is well over. God reigns, and the Government at Washington still lives."

Analogy and comparison.--Watterson employed analogy and

comparison extensively in presenting logical matter. His entire speech on the Puritan and the Cavalier is essentially a comparison of these two regional groups. The comparing process did not always follow the traditional treatment of this material, however, for Watterson chose to demonstrate that prominent Yankees such as Daniel Webster had all the characteristics of the Cavalier, while John C. Calhoun and others like him were avowed Puritans. The ultimate point of his comparison was that the exceptions and deviations in the latter days had cancelled out the differences which earlier existed, so that the residents of North and South were now equated as Americans. In addressing the Bankers, Watterson made use of a hypothetical comparison of the South with and without Northern capital. If investments did not occur, he told them, the area would make slow progress and many resources would "lie hidden in the bowels of the earth." With Northern money, on the other hand, "the South will bloom as a garden and sparkle as a goldmine."

To the Army of the Tennessee, Watterson made an appealing comparison of the arts of war with those of peace, contrasting the odors of roses and gunpowder, the uses of the carving-knife and the bayonet, and the relative merits of projectiles from cannon and wine-bottles. In expressing his pleasure that slavery had been abolished, Watterson compared cotton production under slavery with that under free labor, demonstrating the increased productivity possible and using this as an entry into an argument on why the whites could not afford to mistreat black citizens. One interesting analogy given at the Nashville cemetery involved a library wall in England where hung crossed swords, one used

by a Loyalist in the British civil war, the other by a Republican soldier. This was the sort of regenerate unity, Watterson declared, which Americans must copy.

Causal relationship.—A notable amount of causal reasoning is discernible in Watterson's reunion speaking. He pronounced at Nashville: "To sectionalism and partyism we owe our undoing. We shall owe our restoration to nationalism and nationalism alone." The veterans, as well as most of Watterson's other audiences, were presented with the familiar causal argument that it was a flaw in the Constitution which failed to fix the relationship of the states and the federal government and led eventually to war. Other causal arguments concerned the necessity of fair treatment and good pay for the Negro; otherwise the vital work of the South would not be done. Watterson told the bankers' association that he had always held a thorough respect for bankers because he realized what a significant role they played. Pointing to the salutary effect of the war and defeat on the South, he stated that the trying conditions which arose in the South had brought out the best in the region by promoting industry and thrift and discouraging "gentlemanly vices." Watterson also argued causally in reducing to absurdity the objections of Eastern capital to investing in the South. "What are you afraid of?" the Kentuckian inquired. "Is it our cotton that alarms you? Or our corn? Or our sugar? Perhaps it is our coal and iron." Outlining the role which investment could play in developing the South, he explained: "Without you, in truth, many of these products must make slow progress, while others will continue to lie hid in the bowels of the earth. With you the South will bloom as a garden and sparkle as a gold-mine. . . ." Directing

the attention of the bankers to the prosperous city of Louisville, he continued his causal arguments for investment: "If all this has been achieved . . . Without your powerful aid . . . what might not be achieved if the best aggregations of capital in the fiscal centers should add this land of wine, milk and honey to their fields of investment and give us the same cheap rates which are enjoyed by nearer but not safer borrowers."

Watterson told the Army of the Tennessee that the war was over and forgotten; otherwise he would hardly venture to appear before them and make the address he anticipated. Later he lauded the Union victory by commenting that if the Confederacy had been victorious, the divided and exhausted country would have been a prey to foreign conquest.

Reasoning from example.—Watterson twice reasoned inductively in his Nashville speech, citing the peace and tranquility with which nature had surrounded the cemetery as an admonishment to men to bring their own affairs in accord with her. His other induction was more lengthy. He listed the following examples, concluding that "the world has never seen terms so liberal extended to soldiers beaten in civil broil or known such abstinence from sanguinary revenges during the process of the strife." Grant and Sherman were magnanimous at Appomattox, he said: Lee conducted honors of war for the deceased Kearny; Union soldiers paid homage to the fallen Confederate, Morgan; Confederates mourned at the death of McPherson; Lincoln's assassination was greatly lamented in the South.

Near the end of his extensive comparison of Puritan and Cavalier, the speaker used all the traits which he had attributed to both regional groups and reasoned inductively that all these elements had been combined

into a new national figure, the American.

Summary.--Watterson used general propositions, analogy and comparison, and causal reasoning extensively in these four selected reunion speeches. Reasoning from example and from authority were not extensively employed.

Ethical proof

Watterson several times made use of vicarious praise of his audience in an attempt to gain an ethical response favorable to him and his message. At Nashville he glowingly described the magnanimous terms which he said Grant gave to the Confederates. The former commander came in for the same praise before the Army of the Tennessee. At the New England Society he discussed the admirable qualities which had been possessed by Lincoln. The speaker directly praised the New Englanders in describing how they had cleaned up corrupt New York politics without the use of violence or other excesses. Indirect tribute was aimed toward his listeners in his praise of "the patriarchs of New England," and "the poets of New England," Endicott, Lowell, Winthrop, Longfellow, Norton, and Holmes.

In his speech to the New England Society, Watterson's extensive references in the introduction to his association with Henry W. Grady no doubt functioned as ethical proof, considering that Grady was held in high esteem by the members of the Society. Watterson was careful to point out that he was Grady's teacher and advisor, thereby inferring that he possessed superior knowledge and ability.

Describing himself as no Puritan or Cavalier, Watterson called himself "plain Scotch-Irish," who felt himself superior to the "effete

sectionalism" which the traditional divisions represented. Later in the speech he took up the same argument:

I don't mind telling you . . . it was we Scotch-Irish who vanquished both of you--some of us in peace--others in war--supplying the missing link of adaptibility--the needed ingredient of common sense--the conservative principle of creed and action, to which this generation of Americans owes its intellectual and moral emancipation from frivolity and pharisaism--its rescue from the Scarlet Woman and the mailed hand--and its crystallization into a national character and polity, ruling by force of brains and not force of arms.

At the Nashville cemetery, Watterson introduced his speech with a denial of any sectional or partisan motives. This was his only such declaration of motive except in his address to the bankers, whom he assumed would find him sincere and "wholly businesslike." In beginning his banking address, he told the bankers that his dealings with them had always been pleasing and satisfactory, and that he, like everyone else, was greatly dependent on the services of banks. Later, he attempted to identify himself with the motives and desires of his listeners by stating:

I perfectly understand that business is business, and that capital is as unsectional as unsentimental. I am speaking from neither spirit. You have money to loan. We have a great country to develop. I am not a banker, however, and it would be a kind of effrontery in me to undertake to advise you in your business.

In closing, Watterson sought group identification by proclaiming: "We are all one people. Commercially, financially, morally, we are one people." On two occasions, at the National Cemetery and to the Tennessee veterans, Watterson made reference to his military status, declaring in the latter speech that it was not his failure to be in the front lines, but the bad luck of Federal gunners, that preserved him throughout the war. In summary, Watterson made rather extensive

use of ethical appeals, proclaiming the superiority of his ancestry, declaring his good motives, and striving to identify himself and his interests with those of his listeners, as well as describing his military prowess.

Emotional appeals

The speaker attempted to arouse the scorn of his Nashville audience against the critics whom he said had denounced all the words and acts of good feeling between the sections during and following the war:

I know, my friends, that narrow-minded and embittered partisans will say there is nothing in all this. I know that theorists will declare that great results are not reached through the affections.

Unlike Gordon, however, he did not find it necessary to defend himself constantly against his critics, because he received relatively little criticism. Another emotional appeal at Nashville was to the sense of pity in his listeners. He pictured the South, virtually helpless, pleading with the North not to build up a barrier of sectionalism designed to proscribe the South. Watterson's theme before the Bankers Convention was a basic drive dear to the hearts of his listeners--the desire for profit and security. He therefore emphasized how money could be safely and profitably invested in Southern enterprises, and presumably this ambition was vicariously satisfied.

Humor was a favorite device in Watterson's rhetoric. He displayed a special fondness for the humorous anecdote or "joke." Without exception the subject matter of these stories came from the war and the Confederate government. One, for example, concerned a Confederate soldier who went to the rear whenever his battery was under enemy fire.

His officer finally warned him that if it happened again, he would be shot. The reply was: "That's all right, Capt'n; that's all right; you can shoot me; but I'll be dadburned if I'm going to let them darn'd Yankees do it!" Another described a Georgia farmer who visited Robert Toombs, complaining that the people of his section needed money. When Toombs inquired what he could do about it, the farmer replied that the government ought to "stomp" it. Toombs objected that the government not be able to redeem it, and the farmer rejoined: "That was just what I was coming to. You see, the folks down our way are agin redemption."

Puns and other plays on words were also a source of humor, as in the description of slavery and emancipation. Under the former, "we paid our debts and walloped our niggers," while with the latter "we pay our niggers and wallop our debts." Flattering the bankers, he quipped: "A man may quarrel with his wife; he may sometimes venture a suggestion to his mother-in-law; but he must love, honor, and obey his banker." On the subject of Southern thrift and ambition he had a witty remark to make:

The women of the South took their place by the side of the men of the South, and, with spinning wheel and ploughshare, together they made a stand against the wolf at the door. That was fifteen years ago, and today there is not a reward offered in a single Southern state for wolf-skins. The fact is, the very wolves have got ashamed of themselves and gone to work.

In summary of Watterson's emotional appeals, he attempted to arouse sympathy for the South and to evoke responses closely related to the needs of his audience. He was fond of the use of humor, both in anecdote and pun.

Style

Accuracy

Watterson employed rather exact and colorful language in his reunion speeches, which gave his style considerable accuracy. He described Henry Grady's appearance before the New England Society as occurring "eight years ago," rather than dating the visit in a more general way. Rather than referring to the Westward migration in general, he noted that "Nebraska and Iowa" had stripped New England of some of the best Puritan blood. Puritan and Cavalier alike, he said, were fascinated by "the dizzy whirl of a petticoat." The contents of the Algonquin Club fireplace were described as "a mimic log-heap." In an anecdote about bravery, he described an artillery battery as being commanded by "the brave Captain Howell of Virginia," though this fact had no relevance to the story. Under slavery, he said, cotton production in the South "never reached five million bales," while under free labor, "it is about to reach nine million bales." In describing the desired objective of reunion, Watterson used the specific and striking illustration that "the man who was a Confederate, and is a nationalist, must feel when treading the floor of Faneuil Hall that he is at home." Speaking of elevation of the Negroes, he described the "work of physical liberation" as being followed by "the work of moral emancipation."

Watterson was likewise skilled in his employment of verbs and modifiers, as this statement illustrates: "Those who worship the same God, who kneel at the same shrine, who breathe to Heaven the same prayers, who sing the same songs, in whose mouths the inspiration of-

holy writ and the precepts of Anglo-Saxon freedom are as familiar as household words, can afford no impassable gulfs, cannot seriously and permanently be estranged." A man of extensive experience in journalism, Watterson employed a large and expressive vocabulary in his speaking as well as his writing, with the result that the reader of a Watterson speech is struck with the exactness of his expression, whether in recalling names and dates, or in using colorful verbs and modifiers.

Force

A characteristic of Watterson's use of language was his ability to adjust his choice of words to the audience being addressed. A random sampling of "The Puritan and the Cavalier," delivered to a sophisticated audience of business and professional men, indicates a large number of words containing three, four, and five syllables, and of terms which were probably difficult to comprehend immediately. Some of the apparently difficult words include "fortitude," "sombre," "effect," "mimic," "signalized," "resplendent," "frivolity," "pharisaism," "symmetrical," "gibbet," "dogma," and "vindicate." As may be observed, the words are less challenging for their length than for their probably obscurity. By contrast, "The Nation's Dead," delivered before an unselected public audience at the Nashville cemetery, and "Let Us Have Peace," to an audience of Union veterans, have a preponderance of words of one, two, and three syllables, and a much smaller number of words classifiable as "difficult" or "unfamiliar." Thus Watterson was apparently careful to make an adequate adaptation to what appeared to be the intellectual level of his audience. Watterson's

sentences were often disconcertingly long because of his tendency to insert parenthetical expressions which expanded many of his sentences to considerable length. One such sentence was:

To tell you the truth, I am afraid that I have gained access here on false pretences; for I am no Cavalier at all; just plain Scotch-Irish; one of those Scotch-Irish southerners who ate no fire in the green leaf and has eaten no dirt in the brown, and who, accepting, for the moment, the terms Puritan and Cavalier in the sense an effete sectionalism once sought to ascribe to them--descriptive labels at once classifying and separating North and South--verbal redoubts along that mythical line called Mason and Dixon, over which there are supposed by the extremists of other days to be no bridge--I am very much disposed to say, "A plague o' both your houses."

Another stated:

I can conceive nothing worse for ourselves, nothing worse for our children, than what might have been if the war had ended otherwise, leaving two exhausted combatants to become the prey of foreign intervention and diplomacy, setting the clock of civilization back a century, and splitting the noblest of the continents into five or six weak and warring republics, like those of South America, to repeat in the New World the mistakes of the old.

While a few short sentences are to be found in these speeches, a great many run between one hundred fifty and two hundred words. The sentences are fragmented by parenthetical expression, modifying clauses, prepositional phrases, and appositives, which may have made their comprehension challenging. Nonetheless, Watterson was seldom guilty of redundancy or undue repetition.

Watterson was fond of parallelism in sentence arrangement, and the device was skillfully used. He described Grady, for example, as "my disciple, my protege, my friend." Contrasting the dominant features of Puritan and Cavalier, he appealed "from the men in silken hose who danced to music made by slaves--and called it freedom--from

the men in bell-crowned hats, who led Hester Prynne to her shame and called it religion. . . ." "Blessed be the lesson taught by the past. . . . Blessed be the eye to see, the light to reveal. Blessed be tolerance. . . . Blessed be all that brings us nearer the goal of true religion. . . ." Watterson spoke of the current generation of Southern young men as having "no antecedents except those which illustrated its sincerity and its valor on the battlefield; its fidelity to its leaders; its fidelity to itself." Many other examples of parallel structure are observable, both within and between sentences, which added to the forceful nature of his style.

Suggestiveness

Watterson frequently used language which was probably emotionally connotative in nature. He used such expressions as "the star-spangled banner of our fathers," "divine power," "a nation truly divine," "calm sunshine," "tender shadows," "Free America," "unhonored patriots' graves," "emblematic eagles of the state," "poor maimed soldiers," "flower-covered mounds," "sentient flesh and blood." At times he probably exceeded the bounds of good literary taste in working out his imagery. Witness his description of the Nashville cemetery:

The season brings its tribute to the scene; pays its homage to the dead; inspires the living. There are images of tranquillity all about us; in the clam sunshine upon the ridges; in the tender shadows that creep along the streams; in the waving grass and grain that mark God's love and bounty; in the flowers that bloom over the many, many graves.

He was likewise guilty of grandiloquent rhetoric in his conjectures on the future of the country:

I seek not to lift the veil on what may lie beyond. It is enough for me to know that I have a country and that my country leads the world. I have lived to look upon its dismemberment

and its fragments whole again; to see it; like the fabled bird of wondrous plumage upon the Arabian desert, slowly shape itself above the flames and ashes of a conflagration threatened to devour it; I have watched it gradually unfold its magnificent proportions through alternating tracks of light and shade; I have stood awe-struck in wonder and fear lest the glorious fabric should fade into darkness and prove but the insubstantial pageant of a vision. . . .

In addition to the simile in the above passage, other examples of metaphor and simile are evident in Watterson's addresses. He told the bankers at Nashville that if they would lend money, the South would bloom like a garden and sparkle like a gold mine. He attacked sectionalism analogically by stating: "I no more believe that that river yonder, dividing Indiana and Kentucky, marks off two distinct species than I believe that the great Hudson, flowing through the State of New York, marks off distinct species." Before the New Englanders, Watterson described the terms Puritan and Cavalier as "verbal redoubts along that mythical line called Mason and Dixon, over which there were supposed by the extremists of other days to be no bridges. . . ." Later he metaphorically proclaimed that Lincoln was a "rugged trunk, drawing its sustenance from gnarled roots, interlocked with Cavalier spray and Puritan branches deep beneath the soil," and that there was now appearing "a shapely tree--symmetric in all its parts--under whose sheltering boughs this nation shall have the new birth of freedom Lincoln promised it. . . ." Pointing out that New York had been freed of political corruption, Watterson proclaimed: "It was held like a castle of the Middle Ages by Robber Barons, who levied tribute right and left. Yet the mounds and dykes of corruption have been carried. . . ."

Personification is evident in Watterson's assertion to the bankers: "Whether you tickle her fertile plains with a straw or apply

a more violent titillation to her fat mountainsides, she is ready to laugh a harvest of untold riches!"

Watterson's style may be classified as suggestive by virtue of his connotative language, which occasionally became florid through simile and metaphor.

Ease

Despite Watterson's tendency to the use of rather scholarly language and complex sentences, he was also fond of inserting idiomatic and informal language into his speeches. This may be noted in the following passage from his invitation to the G. A. R. encampment at Pittsburgh. Describing conditions in Louisville, he commented:

You will find there a valorous little army of embryo heroes, who have somehow got so mixed up in their cradles that no one of them can tell which grandpap it was that wore the blue and which wore the gray, but who can lisp their determination to lick all creation when they get big enough. . . . The lid is off the pot and the latch-string hangs outside the door.

He expressed his pleasure at "rubbing against so much money" at the bankers' convention, and said that he never had expected to catch the country's banking system "on the wing" and get "the drop on it." To the New Englanders, he described himself as a Scotch-Irishman who "ate no fire in the green leaf and has eaten no dirt in the brown." From this neutral position, he said, he was inclined to comment, "A plague o' both your houses!" He likewise spoke of Cavaliers who "missed their stirrups and got into Yankee saddles." "The woods," he said, "are full of the." An informal, though obscure, phrase was: "You see it was a groundhog case."

In keeping with this informality of expression, Watterson

employed direct address extensively. Some examples from his New England Society speech include "to tell you the truth," "mark you," "if you wish to get at the bottom facts," and "I don't mind telling you." By contrast, his Lincoln lecture contains no phrases of direct address. The American Bankers' Association received considerable direct reference, with phrases like "I assure you," "the billions you represent," "I am told that you are considering a problem," "I beg you," "you can see for yourself," "you can make a profit," and "our works are before you." In none of the speeches, however, did Watterson employ such phrases as "gentlemen," "fellow-citizens," "patriots," and the like, apparently preferring to integrate his address in expressions growing out of the content of the speech. Watterson's speech may be characterized in summary as possessing ease, accomplished through idiomatic and informal phrases and by means of direct address.

Summary

Watterson employed a style in his reconciliation speeches which possessed many elements of effectiveness. His word choice was exact and colorful. He possessed the ability to adjust his language to the level of sophistication of his audience. His sentences, however, tended to be inordinately long, which may have detracted somewhat from his forcefulness as a speaker. He was fond of using parallelism in sentence construction, both within and between sentences. Language was suggestive and occasionally over-adorned. Simile and metaphor were also employed to some extent. His style produced a feeling of ease through use of informal language and direct address.

Chapter Summary

In terms of stature and national reputation, John B. Gordon, Fitzhugh Lee, Wade Hampton, and Henry Watterson probably occupied the most prominent place in the reconciliation movement. Together they delivered at least 27 speeches in the North. The speeches represent a considerable variety in techniques. Hampton, for example, employed no consistent pattern of arrangement in his speeches. He relied heavily on causal reasoning and ethical appeals, but used emotional proofs relatively little. His style was unadorned for the most part, and he used a minimum of specific language. Lee avoided many of the controversies in which his colleagues became involved and talked in general terms about reconciliation. Employing a similar pattern of arrangement in all his five speeches, he utilized general propositions in logical proof, with a minimum of ethical and emotional statements. Though his discourse lacked adornment, he was successful in combining specific language with skillfully-composed sentences to achieve a rather forceful style. As for Gordon, if one may judge from the texts of his speeches, he was careless in arranging the materials in his discourse. All types of logical materials were incorporated with ethical and emotional statements in the establishment of his theses. Gordon's style possessed some ease and suggestiveness, though it frequently lacked color and conciseness. Henry Watterson was the most prolific of the group, delivering at least twelve reunion speeches. Details of some of them were carefully integrated, while others possessed random arrangement. Analogy and deductive reasoning formed the bulk of Watterson's logical reasoning. Though probably well-known

and respected, he nevertheless used a considerable amount of ethical proof. Emotional proof was kept at a minimum. Stylistically, Watterson's speeches were probably the most noteworthy of those delivered in the reconciliation movement.

CHAPTER V

PROBABLE INFLUENCE OF SOUTHERN RECONCILIATION SPEAKERS IN THE NORTH

In undertaking the considerable task of assessing the probable impact of the Southern reconciliation speeches upon the thinking of Northerners, it will be necessary to inspect prevailing attitudes toward the South in the late nineteenth century. An understanding of the obstacles and challenges faced by the Southern reconciliation speakers can thus be gained, and once Northern attitudes are appreciated they can be used in establishing the probable effectiveness of the efforts of the Southern speakers.

The End of War and the Beginning of Reconstruction

The cessation of hostilities at Appomattox led to a multiplicity of social, economic, and political developments, of which perhaps the major were the nullification of the doctrine of secession, the destruction of slavery as an institution, and the long-term ascendancy of the Republican Party in the central government. This latter development brought with it Republican demands for civil and political privileges for the Negro and the establishment of fiscal and tariff policies consistent with the expanding industry of the Northeast and North Central states. In one form or another, these developments were

at the center of most of the conflicts between the sections until after the turn of the century.

No treaty ended the fighting after the collapse of the Confederacy. The agreement between Grant and Lee established only that the Confederate forces had surrendered unconditionally, that the officers might retain their side-arms, and that the Confederate horses and mules might be used for spring planting. What the Union victory had established, aside from the emancipation of the slaves and the collapse of the Confederate government, was unclear. Such matters as the relationship of the seceded states and federal responsibility for the freedmen were undefined. Thus the terms of peace were determined, not in a dignified conference, but in the councils of the conquerors--in the Congress, the churches, schools, political conventions, and homes of the Northern people, and by the editors of newspapers and magazines.

It was public opinion which gave license to the Congress and the Grant administration to dictate the penalty for revolt. This process of determining the peace terms was begun during the war and continued fitfully for three decades. Initially, at least, the South had little part in these deliberations. Before June, 1868, Southern representation came only through the border states of Maryland, Delaware, Kentucky, Missouri, and Tennessee. Without honor in the Republican governments of their own states, the leaders in secession and in the Confederacy were largely occupied with the elemental matters of physical survival. Meanwhile, Northern newspapers were sending their war correspondents into the conquered territory and their words were eagerly read in the North. As Buck describes the situation:

The South itself did nothing, possibly could do nothing to assist in shaping the publicity so vitally affecting its welfare. The North had only Northerners to do the reporting. And these men possessed in common with their reading public the biased views in regard to the South that had been shaped in time of war. The result was inevitable. The predilections of the North in regard to the South were strengthened and again the consequence was increased misunderstanding.¹

The South and the nation could ill afford this further compounding of misunderstanding, heaped as it was atop three decades of intense abolition propaganda, the frustration of compromise politics on the slavery issue, the tensions of threatened secession in 1859 and 1860, and four years of civil conflict in which militant propaganda was employed to overcome initial lethargy and to maintain morale in the face of agitation for compromise and early settlement of the conflict.

One theme damaging to Northern acceptance of the South concerned the treatment of Federal prisoners in Southern prisoner-of-war camps. A number of popular books portrayed luridly the life in these camps, and claims of bestiality were effectively substantiated in the Northern mind by the widely published report which Secretary of War Edwin Stanton made to President Andrew Johnson July 19, 1866, in which 22,567 Northerners were listed as dying in Southern prisons.² To the North, the name of Andersonville and Libby prisons were the symbol of the depths to which the degenerate, defeated Confederacy could fall in sadism and brutality. Yet these claims were never challenged by the observation that the Southern captors were suffering as gravely as their prisoners from lack of proper food, clothing, and medical care. The friction arising from the presence of occupation troops and

¹Buck, op. cit., p. 16.

²Coulter, op. cit., p. 129.

large numbers of freedmen in the South produced riots such as those at Memphis, New Orleans, and Camilla, Georgia, and gave additional weight to the charges that the South remained rebellious and unrepentant. Less spectacular were the state laws and local restrictions for the regulation of the freedmen, though these "Black Codes" aroused much animosity in the North.

It was from individuals steeped in the vindictiveness of victory that the Radicals in Congress drew their strength. The following editorial suggests the zeal of public supporters of a punitive policy for the conquered states:

If time was at first needed, Congress has now had time. All the requisite materials from which to form an intelligent judgement are now before it. Whether its members look at the origin, the progress, the termination of the war, or at the mockery of a peace now existing, they will find only one unbroken chain of argument in favor of a radical policy of reconstruction. The members go to Washington fresh from the inspiring presence of the people. In every considerable public meeting and in almost every conceivable way . . . the people have emphatically pronounced in favor of a radical policy. Radicalism, so far from being odious, is now the popular passport to power. The men most bitterly charged with it go to Congress with the largest majorities. . . .

The people demand such a reconstruction as shall put an end to the present anarchial state of things in the late rebellious states--where frightful murders and wholesale massacres are perpetuated in the very presence of Federal troops. They want a reconstruction such as will protect loyal men . . . such a one as will cause Northern industry, Northern capital and Northern civilization to flow into the South, and make a man from New England as much at home in Carolina as elsewhere in the Republic.¹

Probably this manifesto represented the attitude of a majority of Northerners, who believed that the former Rebels and slaveholders were inherently wicked and must not be allowed to regain political power or the Union might even be again ruptured and slavery reinstated.

¹"Reconstruction," Atlantic Monthly, XVII (December 1866), 763.

In addition to endorsing this opinion, the radical Republicans realistically opposed the restoration of an unreconstructed South largely because the restoration of the Southern states would make probable a combination of Southern Democrats with Conservative Northern Republicans and Northern Democrats that would break the Radical control of the Congress. So far as the Radicals were concerned, therefore, admonitions against the trustworthiness of the ex-Rebels were in great part political devices to keep the Radicals in power.

In general, the same was true of the question of Negro rights. While perhaps there were some men in the Radical fold who were genuinely concerned with the Negro's welfare, most of the Radicals were doubtless interested in the Negro because he could be counted on to vote Republican. The idea of Negro suffrage faced too much opposition in the North for the Radicals to make it an avowed issue of the 1866 congressional campaign, however.¹ Realizing that they were in a minority at the war's end, the Radical leaders sought to delay formulation of a Southern policy while the people were properly "educated." With the 1866 elections the Republicans were able to secure a two-thirds majority in Congress and a favorable public attitude for the operation of their plans. The real issues facing the country, however, were kept in the background during the campaign, while the Radicals employed misrepresentation and vituperation to gain their ends.²

Economic questions in particular were kept obscured. Still to be determined were such matters as a tax policy, a monetary policy, the

¹"Reconstruction," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, ed. by Edwin Seligman (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948), XIII, 169.

²Ibid.

role of the national banks in the economy, governmental attitude toward monopoly practices, and the tariff question. While high tariff supporters had been in a hopeless minority before the war, they were able after Southern withdrawal from the Union to overcome opposition from the Northwestern farmers and establish a policy of high protection. On these matters the Radicals could not afford to allow the Southerners to pass judgment. Objections to the Radical program were silenced by "bloody shirt" appeals.

The Nation, practically alone among the opinion-shaping influences of the North, attempted to maintain a proper perspective of the situation. If the writer of the following editorial proved a poor prophet, he was nonetheless frank in his appraisal of the Radicals:

The great difficulty with which Thaddeus Stevens and those who think with him have to contend in advocating their plans for the punishment and pacification of the South is that these plans are opposed to the genius of American institutions and to the temper of the times; and that they are therefore sure not to be tried, or if tried, are sure not to succeed. Confiscation, disfranchisement, retaliation, proscription of all kinds, as means either of reconciling large bodies of men to a new and distasteful order of things or of acquiescence, are expedients borrowed from medieval or pagan times--expedients that 50 generations of tyrants and conquerors have tried and found worthless; expedients which no man who reverences human nature, and who desires its elevation, will ever desire to see succeed.

If there be any principle at the base of our Government and society, it is that the great remedy for disaffection is equality, protection and freedom of speech, and that there is no worse way of making men orderly and submissive to law than putting them under a ban of disability.¹

Four years later another editorial writer was to pronounce:

The reconstruction process has no social power whatever. It is purely political in its nature and effects. It sees to the form of the Constitution, and to the composition of

¹"The Reconstruction Discussion," Nation, II (May 22, 1866), 648f.

one legislature. But it contains no ingredient which reaches the relationship of man to man.

The evils of the present social and political conditions of the South are indisputable, but they are not curable by legislation. They are things which will only disappear slowly, and will never disappear except under the influence of a general improvement in Southern Society. . . .¹

Such isolated analyses of reconstruction availed little, however, against the editorials of George William Curtis and the cartoons by Thomas Nast in Harper's Weekly, and against the almost universally unfriendly attitude of the Republican press.

Objections to radicalism were discounted by whatever means available. The omnibus Fourteenth Amendment was designed to leave the South without leadership at a time when statesmanship was most needed. Thus the amendment became intolerable alike to Southern Democrats and to Northern conservatives, the latter who might have accepted such provisions as the guarantee of Negro rights, the repudiation of the Confederate debt, and the guarantee of the federal debt. Thus it was possible for the Radicals to denounce all who objected to the Amendment, though their objection might be only to the punitive sections.

Meanwhile, in the South the up-country farmers were seeking union with the planters, from whom they had traditionally been separated by economic and social ideals, to confront and combat the freedmen under the leadership of Northern Carpetbaggers. The campaign waged by the Southerners included subterfuge, threats, and open violence. One of many such incidents was the riot at Camilla, Georgia, September 19, 1868, in which a party of armed Negro Republicans ostensibly attempting to hold a political rally, were confronted by a group of armed whites and

¹"The Cure for the South," Ibid., X (January 20, 1870), 36.

found themselves involved in a pitched battle which resulted in death or injury to at least forty persons. Accounts of the affair by military officials and statements by Bullock, the Radical Georgia governor, appeared prominently in Northern newspapers and magazines.

About 1871, it became apparent that the frenzy of the Northern people toward their conquered enemies could not be maintained at a sufficient peak to keep the South Republican by force. A series of highly partisan amnesty bills, the first passed June 28, 1868, removed the political disabilities from a number of "scalawags"¹ who quickly occupied offices in the Republican governments of many of the Southern states. In the succeeding four years the agitation for a general amnesty bill became sufficiently strong that in 1872, a year after the repeal of the "Ironclad Oath," the General Amnesty bill was passed. In 1877 President Hayes issued an order withdrawing the last of the Federal troops from the South.²

Thereafter the North exhibited a fitful friendliness toward the South, generally encouraging and occasionally patronizing in her analysis of developments in the South, but frequently moved to protest at apparent infringements of Negro rights or evidences of renascent loyalty to the old Confederacy. It was during this period of unsettled governmental policy and vacillating public opinion that the Southern orators found occasion to present their messages of peace and good will in the North.

The fact that iron-clad control of the Congress by 1872 had slipped from the hands of the most extreme Radicals did not mean that

¹ Southern whites who sought friendship and affiliation with the Republican governments of the Southern states.

² Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, op. cit., XIII, 171

the "bloody shirt" would cease to be flourished from Maine to Iowa during the succeeding eighteen years. On the contrary, it passed to the hands of a generation of Republicans who employed it in denouncing their Democratic opponents at virtually all political levels from the local to the national. Intimidation of Southern Republicans and attacks on the Negro were described as "little Providences, which come along to save the forgiving North from losing itself in a mush of sentiment regarding the South."¹ Harper's Weekly, indignant at denunciations of the "bloody shirt," thundered:

It might be supposed, if there were no other source of knowledge than the papers, that the bloody shirt was both an obsolete and a wicked delusion; that there were not and never had been any "outrages" upon the colored people in the Southern States; that nothing could well be more beautiful than the fraternal relations which exist between races . . . and that any body in this Centennial year--this hundredth year since the Declaration, whose great doctrine we have so sedulously respected in this country--who does not confine himself to rejoicing over our happy reunion, but looks to see the facts, is an apostle of hate, delighting to dabble his fingers in the gore of the bloody shirt which he wickedly shakes in the pained eyes of peaceful brethren. . . . The actual situation of the country, the state of opinion and feeling, undeniable facts and tendencies in the various States, will necessarily be a cardinal issue in the election this year, whether it be called the gospel of hate and the bloody shirt, or common-sense and patriotic sagacity.²

The principal "bloody shirt" themes of the seventies were charges that white Republicans were being intimidated, that freedmen were being deprived of their rights, and that the Democratic party remained in spirit and substance the same as it had been before and during the war, i. e., the party of treason and disunion, embracing the Solid South,

¹"The North and the South," Harper's Weekly, XX (January 29, 1876), 82.

²"The Bloody Shirt," Ibid., XX (February 26, 1876), 162.

the corrupt Tammany Hall machine, and the Copperheads of the West. Thus the Northern people were presumably presented with the choice of maintaining in power candidates of the party of Lincoln and Grant, or gambling on a party which had encouraged secession, impeded the war effort, and had as its most loyal constituents the unrepentant Rebels.

Despite such defections as the Liberal Republican movement of 1872, and such political strategy as the "New Departure" in the Democratic camp, the "bloody-shirt" Republicans continued to have matters largely their own way during the 1870's. The trumpetings of abuse and defense reached a crescendo in the campaign of 1876, when the political spokesmen of Rutherford B. Hayes switched from a moderate position to strong Radical sentiments on the eve of the election. After his election, however, Hayes committed himself to a policy of leniency, withdrawing the last of the Federal troops from the South and appointing ex-Confederate David Key to his cabinet. With dazzling speed, the influential Harper's Weekly fell in behind the president, though the influence of its editorial page was probably counteracted by the cartoons of Thomas Nast. It cannot be said in honesty that all the elements of the North joyously joined the president in smoothing the way of the South to full brotherhood, and the influence of those who sought to promote good will was hampered by a suspiciously light Negro Republican vote in the Congressional elections of 1878. Thus the campaign of 1880 was in general the same tiresome story, although James G. Blain announced to Dwight W. Sabin, chairman of the Republican National Committee, in September, 1880, that the bloody shirt was dwindling in its efficacy and that the tariff must be introduced as an

issue.¹ Politics as the major source of sectional division received its strongest blow in the 1884 presidential campaign, when probity in office was the principal campaign issue.²

Though the Democratic victory was hailed widely as the end of the bloody shirt, and though the nation actually was not to see another national campaign in which it appeared as a major issue, it was to appear in various hues through the closing years of the century. Most frequently it appeared in connection with the disfranchisement of the Negro Republican, and under the sponsorship of such men as Murat Halstead, J. B. Foraker, Henry Cabot Lodge, and George F. Hoar. It can be seen from this summary that the political situation had a profound influence upon arguments that Southerners in the North might expound. At the same time it vitally affected the acceptance of their utterances, because of the extent to which it represented a molding influence on the attitudes of the Northern populace. Before proceeding to assessment of the probable influence of the Southern orators, it will be well to examine briefly the prevailing attitudes in the North toward the idea of reconciliation in general.

The North and Reconciliation

It can be readily believed that under the influence of vigorous Republican campaigning plus assessment of reports concerning the action of Southerners in regard to civil rights for the freedmen, the North would interpret any cry of "peace" as an unprincipled attempt

¹William Hudson, Random Recollections of an Old Political Reporter (New York: Cripples, 1911), pp. 112f.

²Buck, op. cit., p. 271.

to escape the consequences of the war and to reinstate the social and political ideals of the Old South. An example of such an attitude was the denunciation of Horace Greeley's campaign speeches of 1872 by

Harper's Weekly:

The whole campaign of "reconciliation" is as monstrous a deception as that of "reform." Not a single measure has been suggested, no policy whatever has been foreshadowed, except for the purpose of producing Democratic votes. It is called "reconciliation;" there is no argument but the character of the Democratic party. . . . The character of the Democratic party campaign has been very thoroughly exposed. . . . It would be a sad augury for the future if the people of the country could be deceived by so plain an imposture.¹

An equally skeptical, though non-political, analysis of acts of reconciliation is found in the observations of a private citizen attending the Massachusetts Centennial observances of 1876. Of the ceremonies, which included parades of Southern military regiments and speeches by former Confederate leaders, he observed: "They were performances; we had no right to expect anything else, for genuine unconscious emotion is as rare here as it has been in all times and places."² Apparently he was implying that the demonstrations of amity by the Southerners and their hosts were only empty shows without a basic feeling of friendship.

Skepticism concerning the efficacy of a Centennial in achieving good feeling is likewise to be found in a review of Lucius Lamar's Congressional speech favoring an appropriation for the Philadelphia Exposition: "The assumption that perfect fraternity of feeling can be

¹"The Cry of Reconciliation," XVI (October 19, 1872), 802.

²Norton, op. cit., II, 51f.

accomplished by any Centennial sentiment is simply foolish. . . .¹

A month later, Harper's again struck a blow at statements of reconciliation such as those contained in speeches by Southerners when it wrote:

There has been something of a disposition to think that a better mutual understanding could be brought about by a mutual effusion of "gush" and sentimentality. But this has fortunately been confined to a very few persons. Phrases play an important part in politics. But they are not strong enough to heal the wounds of a difference so radical and bitter as that which has long divided the characteristic spirit and ability of the old Free and the old Slave States.²

Decoration Day orations came in for a similar tongue-lashing:

Let us have done with this Decoration Day twaddle! The right was the right, and wrong and right can never shake hands over a bunch of flowers. The true Southern people have no wish to obtrude their attachment for their principles upon the rest of the world. . . . But they do not propose to blot out their history by such empty and abject twaddle as that indulged in by the Decoration Day orators, who roll up the whites of their eyes and say "God knows who was right."³

A symbolic act of friendship in 1887 by President Grover Cleveland, the so-called "battle-flag order," in which Cleveland instructed that the Confederate flags in possession of the government be returned to the Southern states from which they came, encountered a storm of protest, particularly from G. A. R. posts. This turmoil interrupted plans to return Confederate colors captured at Gettysburg as a part of a joint celebration of the battle.

Thus, in addition to the burdens which his political position and previous loyalties imposed upon him, the Southern orator in the

¹"Centennial Conciliation," Harper's Weekly, XX (February 12, 1876), 122.

²Ibid., XXI (March 17, 1877), 202.

³New York Times, April 12, 1877, p. 3.

North could expect that his effort might be denounced as an act of empty symbolism and an attempt to gloss over the real issues in sectional relations. While this condition might at first appear to have created a dilemma which left the reconciliation orator with no tenable position, such was not the case in practice. For reasons discussed below, the public was far more ready to accept the Southern orator who talked in platitudes and generalities than the one who sought reunion through intellectual appraisal of Southern attitudes toward issues at conflict. It was an understanding of this propensity which enabled most of the orators to mince their way delicately through the field of sectional controversy, with an occasional leap over issues which could not be flanked, and arrive safely at the end of a speech with the acclaim of the audience loud in their ears. To say this is not to deny the efficacy of the Southerners, who were, after all, meeting fire with oratorical fire. For the most part they strove not for a specific overt act at the conclusion of the speech, but for an altered emotional or intellectual set which might lead the listener to future overt acts or fortify him against challenges to the speaker's position.

Reconciliation As An Emotional Manifestation

The waging of war, with the necessity of mobilizing its civilian soldiers and unifying all its citizens in support of national ideals inevitably involves a tremendous emotional stimulation of all its people. To the tensions produced by necessary propaganda must be added additional anxieties concerning the success of the military operation and regarding the personnel involved in specific campaigns. When the

struggle is a civil one, old loyalties based upon the sharing of joint social, cultural, and political institutions may further increase the emotional strain. The end of war, at least in the United States, has often been followed by a period of reaction and lethargy to the war and the ideals for which it was fought. With the American Civil War, however, the war propaganda was maintained at a high pitch for at least six years after the end of the fighting. When a reaction came at last to the pressures of the war and reconstruction, the desire for reconciliation became almost a national obsession, especially in the North. To be sure, there were such cold-blooded motivations in reunion as practical politics and the desire for capital gain; yet the reason for many of the acts of reconciliation must be sought elsewhere. Furthermore, many of the schemes devised by well-meaning individuals were sufficiently bizarre that they might be described by modern-day psychologists as bordering on the neurotic.

Some of the more unlikely schemes were rejected by public opinion as being too extreme even for the prevailing attitude, while others equally improbable were accepted. As early as 1869, the Georgia Agricultural Society proposed to make their annual fair on November 16 a Peace Jubilee, and invited the president, vice-president, the cabinet, Congress, the governors of all the states, and all the generals who had participated in the recent hostilities. In extending the invitation the fair committee commented: "When a large concourse of people from all sections of the Union shall witness the meeting and exchange of civilities between distinguished and trusted men from all sections--shall see the great and idolized chieftains of the two late

contending armies meet and shake hands on the same platform . . . shall actually witness a restoration of the Union in the hearts of the people-- much, very much will be accomplished for the country which has not been done by law and garrison."¹

Three years later, in September, 1872, a "Peace Reunion" was held in Louisville, dedicated to the works of peace, where it was optimistically hoped that "one hundred thousand patriots" would "shake hands across the bloody chasm." The reunion was to be a "declaration on the part of the people that they are tired of war passions in time of peace and protest against the pains and penalties and proscriptions which have been fostered upon the limbs of one section of the Union."²

In 1875 occurred the serio-comic events surrounding the invitation of Jefferson Davis to appear at various public celebrations in the North. In July, 1875, a committee connected with the Soldiers' National Reunion being held at Caldwell, Ohio, extended an invitation to Jefferson Davis and Alexander H. Stephens to attend, along with all Confederate soldiers and sailors. The invitation read in part: "Our reunion means peace and good will. We open our arms to receive you. We pray you all to come. The war is over forever." Apparently the invitation was largely ignored in the South. It does not appear in a compilation of Davis's correspondence which includes other invitations

¹"The Georgia Jubilee," Harper's Weekly, XIII (October 30, 1869), 691. The society had to be content with a few Confederate officers.

²Louisville Courier-Journal, cited by Ellis M. Coulter, The Civil War and Readjustment in Kentucky (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina, 1926), p. 439. Again the optimistic expectations of the promoters greatly exceeded the number attending.

for Northern addresses and visits.¹

The invitations extended to Davis to address the Agricultural societies of Columbus, Indiana, and Rockford, Illinois, later in the same summer, and the reactions to these invitations, reveal much about the Northern mind and reconciliation. The Rockford invitation, dated July 16, and reiterated August 1 when no answer was forthcoming, guaranteed "a grand ovation of 40,000 hearers and a compensation of \$500."² A most outspoken opinion of the proposed visit appeared in the Chicago Inter-Ocean: "It is a gross insult to every decent man woman and child in this state." Despite the fact that thousands of Northern soldiers lay in their graves, continued the commentator, "the murderer and despoiler" was invited to partake of the hospitalities of the Northern people and "lecture to them and their children on the duties of citizenship."³

A less emphatic, if no more complimentary comment appeared in Harper's Weekly:

Nobody in this part of the country probably wishes to hear Jefferson Davis's opinions upon any subject whatever. He is not asked to speak because he is an eloquent man, nor because of his popularity, nor of the general love and respect for him as a public character, nor on account of his intellectual ability or special authority, but simply because he was the representative rebel in the rebellion. The object is to gratify a morbid curiosity and put money in the purses of speculators, or to make some kind of political capital. But to see any political significance in his coming is absurd. Any man, however famous as a rebel, may come and go through these states at his pleasure. . . . He certainly has done nothing which deserves recognition or gratitude, and it is not necessary to have him stand upon a Northern platform in

¹Dunbar Rowland (ed.) Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist (Jackson: Mississippi: Mississippi Department of Archives and History, 1923).

²Ibid., p. 425f.

³Quoted in Coulter, The South During Reconstruction, 1865-1877, op. cit., p. 384.

in order to show that there is no vindictive feeling toward the Southern States.¹

Another writer warned:

He will visit a county which is not only the banner county of agriculture, but the banner county of National Republicanism since the war, and of opposition to State sovereignty and Jefferson Davis as its chief embodiment during the rebellion. . . . He will speak in a section of the country which made a more determined assault on the secession movement which he headed than perhaps any other part of the United States; that single county furnished five or six complete regiments.²

The Duluth Minnesotan chose to give a more favorable commercial interpretation of Davis's reasons for coming to Illinois, but was not more enthusiastic about the possibilities of his speech-making:

Among the various notices which have appeared in the public press concerning the invitation of Jeff Davis, the arch-traitor . . . none seem to have given him the true justice as to the motive which impelled him to accept such an invitation.

We must give Davis credit for being a sincere and candid man, and consistent in all the undertakings which his political record have shown to the country. And it is fair to assume that his willingness to address a northwest assemblage was to impress a necessity for a commercial union or confederation of interests of all the producing elements of the valley of the Mississippi.

While the North might be willing to read in print the essays of Davis upon his commercial theory . . . they do not feel like standing in the presence of the man who is the personal representative of all the ills which the mistakes and wickedness of the South has brought upon the whole country. . . .

Mr. Davis has already had too much prominence in this country. His place is not in the rostrum, but in the quiet walks of life. . . .³

The proposed Davis visit was not without its humor. Two St. Louis editors, John N. Edwards of the St. Louis Times and Emory S. Foster of

¹XIX September 18, 1875), 755.

²New York Times, August 15, 1875, p. 6.

³Duluth Minnesotan, September 4, 1875, p. 1

the St. Louis Evening Journal, became so violent in their disagreement over the merits of the Davis visit that they fought a duel on the banks of the Mississippi. Their ardor apparently exceeded their marksmanship, however, because neither man was injured, and the whole matter "ended in good feeling."¹

The Winnebago County Agricultural Association was not the only organization anxious to secure the services of Davis, according to the following account:

Jefferson Davis seems lately to have been greatly in demand as the orator for agricultural societies' fairs. The Memphis Appeal shows that in addition to the invitation from the society in Winnebago County, Illinois, he had sixteen others from similar societies. Four came from Illinois, two from Indiana, two from Pennsylvania, three from Missouri, one from Iowa, two from Wisconsin, one from Louisiana, and one from Maryland. They have all been declined. One came from a "weak Baptist church" in Lancaster, Penn., the clerk of which wrote: "We are in debt, and in aid of this church we should like to have you come and deliver a lecture for us on some subject such as you might select--the condition of the South, or the future prospects of the South, or the country, or something else, if you choose. And if you come early in the Fall, I might procure other places in connection with this for you to lecture, say Baltimore, Harrisburg, Reading and Philadelphia."²

Perhaps unfortunately, Davis did not visit the "weak Baptist Church," nor did he accept any other Northern invitation. Apparently he took a cue from H. P. Kimball of the Winnebago Society, who wrote on August 11:

The announcement of our engagement with you to address the Winnebago County Industrial [sic] Association, has created such wholly unexpected opposition, among our citizens, composed almost wholly of members of the Grand Army, arousing them to the expression of the most bitter remonstrances and most unfriendly threats, that for your own peace and honor, as well as for the preservation and integrity of our own Society, I deem

¹Ibid., September 6, 1875, p. 3.

²New York Times, August 24, 1875, p. 10.

it prudent to cancel the engagement.¹

Meanwhile Davis had been entertaining similar thoughts, for he dispatched a letter to Kimball declining the invitation on the grounds that he had just received a printed protest of a number of committee members against the action of the Society board in asking him to appear.²

Probably the significance of the event for purposes of this study is that while zealous reconcilers might go to any lengths to promote good will, or profit, or both, there was a certain limit of sensibility beyond which the Northern people could not be pushed, and an invitation to the most notable living symbol of the Confederacy exceeded that limit. Apparently it was the individual, and not the act of speaking on reconciliation, that made the difference. Only two years later Wade Hampton accepted the invitation of the Winnebago County Society and was enthusiastically received and kindly treated. In 1887, plans for John B. Gordon to address the National Soldiers' Home in Columbus, Ohio, were hastily cancelled as a result of protests from the Columbus Grand Army posts, whereas Henry Watterson had been welcomed there in 1878. The principal difference seems to have been that Gordon had the previous week introduced and eulogized Jefferson Davis at a Confederate celebration in Georgia.³

¹Rowland, op. cit., p. 437f.

²Ibid., p. 438f.

³Another apparent inconsistency in regard to Southern overtures of reconciliation should be noted at this point. In 1895 a monument to the Confederates who died in Chicago prison camps was erected in Chicago, chiefly through efforts of the Chicago Columbia post of the G. A. R., and the dedicatory address was made by ex-rebel Wade Hampton. Four years later in Columbus, Ohio, the flower committee of the G. A. R. rejected a floral offering sent by the Confederates of Kentucky to be placed on the Union Soldier's lot as part of Memorial Day ceremonies.

Still another manifestation of reconciliatory compulsion is illustrated by the action of a number of Northerners who settled in the South after the war and formed a permanent organization in Charlotte, North Carolina, to interpret the South to the North. According to a spokesman for the organization, the Southerners "visit our firesides and welcome us to the privileges of public worship, and sympathize in our sorrows and afflictions; they admire sturdy integrity and real principle; their definition of what these things are correspond with the idea of the same which our neighbors in the North held in common with us."¹

Perhaps the most self-conscious event in the reconciliation movement, and one which illustrates the faith of the people in symbolic acts of reunion, occurred on Decoration Day, 1875, in Little Rock, Arkansas. A holiday was declared and a majority of the population went to the cemetery where both Federals and Confederates were buried, for a joint commemoration of the dead. The speakers' platform was built over portions of the adjoining cemeteries, so that a Northern orator could speak from ground hallowed by Confederates, while a Southerner could stand above soil consecrated by the Union dead. The high point of the ceremonies occurred when a former Confederate buried a hatchet in the Union Cemetery while a Union veteran was similarly disposing of one in the Confederate cemetery.²

To Joseph Johnston, former Confederate general and later representative from Virginia, was attributed a "patriotic and graceful thing" on May 29, 1879, when he moved the adjournment of the House of

¹Greenville Enterprise and Mountaineer, January 22, 1879, quoted in Coulter, The South During Reconstruction, op. cit., p. 385.

²Boston Daily Advertiser, cited by Buck, op. cit., p. 120f.

Representatives over Decoration Day so that the deeds of the Northern soldiery might be glorified. So far from being considered incongruous by those present, "the delicate tact and noble courtesy of Gen. Johnston's performance commanded instant silence in the House, followed quickly by spontaneous applause from both sides of the chamber."¹

The decade after 1880 saw a tremendous upswing in the numbers of reconciliation rituals, with the Grand Army and the Confederate veterans setting the pace in a continual and increasing series of reunions, first between local groups of veterans from such cities as Trenton and Newark, New Jersey, Carlisle and Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and Washington, D. C., meeting with ex-Rebels from Luray, Fredericksburg, and Richmond, Virginia, and Owensburg, Kentucky. Later reunions were held between survivors of entire armies on the site of such battles as Antietam and Gettysburg. Southerners, meanwhile, were holding industrial and agricultural expositions in Atlanta, Nashville, New Orleans, and elsewhere, at which "they performed rituals of reconciliation and nationalism and held reunions of Blue and Gray--without which none of these affairs were complete."²

In 1880 the New Orleans Mardi Gras was made the scene of such an overt bid for friendship when the New York Seventy-First Infantry of the National Guard appeared, having received an ovation along the way and a highly enthusiastic reception in New Orleans. John F. Cowan, a member of the party, published an account of the trip entitled A New Invasion of the South, Being a Narrative of the Expedition of the

¹ Springfield Republican, June 4, 1879, p. 3.

² Woodward, op. cit., p. 124f.

Seventy-First Infantry, National Guard, Through the Southern States to New Orleans.¹

Any account of reconciliation manifestations would not be complete without a mention of the funeral of U. S. Grant, in which ceremonies former Rebels took part virtually equal with that of Union Veterans. Joseph Johnston and Simon Buckner, distinguishable as ex-Confederates by their grey silk sashes, officiated as pall-bearers with Federals William T. Sherman, Phil Sheridan, and John Logan, while Fitzhugh Lee, Wade Hampton, and John B. Gordon also had a part in the procession.² One writer, at least, approved of the presence of the Southerners:

Nothing in the whole march was more impressive than the appearance of these men, who came not as prisoners of war, not even as vanquished in war, but as proud citizens of a free state following their own will, and by their presence effacing from the pageant the character of a political or local demonstration, and making it far more the declaration of present and future national unity than the apotheosis of a great struggle.³

Repentant Harper's Weekly, evidently eager to join the rush of reconciliation once more, organized an expedition of writers and artists which toured the South. Their glowing accounts of Southern industrial development and social progress appeared serially in the magazine for almost three months, beginning January 15, 1887.

The veterans' reunions of 1895 saw two additional incidents which bordered on the maudlin. In that year was dedicated Chikamauga

¹Coulter, The South During Reconstruction, op. cit., p. 389.

²Benjamin Andrews, History of the Last Quarter Century in the United States, 1870-1895. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), p. 181.

³Independent, XXXVII (August 13, 1885), 1044.

National Cemetery, a joint project of the federal government, Georgia and Tennessee. The dedication was attended by Vice-President Adlai Stevenson, several members of the cabinet, the governors of thirteen states, and assorted generals from the old Union and Confederate armies. There were lengthy reunions of Northern and Southern troops and parades of Army units. One of the features of the event was the appearance of an Atlanta National Guard Unit dressed entirely in Confederate Uniforms.¹

Henry Watterson had visited the national encampment of the G. A. R. in Pittsburgh in 1894 and convinced the assembly that they could perform a true act of reconciliation by holding their next annual convention on Southern soil at Louisville. The reunion came to the Kentucky city, touted as a "veritable love-feast," and was the scene of countless official and unofficial acts of friendliness between the Union men and the ex-Confederates who visited the city. At one of the mass meetings held in Louisville Music Hall, a reconciliation tableau took place, in which a soldier dressed in blue and one in gray marched to the footlights, threw away their guns, and shook hands. "It was heartily cheered." All the literature printed in connection with the convention together with banners and badges, carried the imprint of the handshaking pair.²

While other examples might be brought to bear, these incidents serve to emphasize the importance which acts of reconciliation had gained in the minds of the people. In consideration of the numbers of occasions

¹ Andrews, op. cit., pp. 356ff.

² Louisville Courier-Journal, September 12, 1895, p. 1.

upon which the ex-Confederates addressed or were invited to address Northern audiences and the enthusiasm with which they were greeted, it may be concluded that as a group the speakers satisfied a desire on the part of their listeners to hear and approve words and symbols of returning good feeling. The evidence indicates that few of the Southern speakers charged bravely into situations where they were met by stern-faced audiences waiting grimly to be convinced that the South once more was loyal and desired peace and good will. Rather, their job was to focalize the favorable sentiment already existing in the minds of their listeners and to present the intellectual content of their speeches in a manner palatable and inoffensive to the audiences.

A Description and Analysis of Immediate and Secondary Reactions to the Southern Orators

An overview of collected data concerning immediate reactions to specific speeches, as well as secondary impressions appearing in editorial form in newspapers and magazines following the speeches, reveals a remarkably small number of unfavorable reactions to the addresses included in the study. Since reconciliation has been defined as the lessening of tensions between the North and South and the promotion of friendship and understanding between the sections, a favorable audience reaction is taken as prima facie evidence of the general acceptance either of the speaker as a personality, of the ideas which he expressed, or both. Regardless of whether the ovation occurred for the speech, or only for the speaker, the progress of reconciliation was furthered.

The fact that anti-reconciliation comments concerning the speeches were so limited is noteworthy when one considers that virtually all the press sources from which accounts and editorials were taken

tended to be anti-Southern in their attitudes during much of the period studied. No accounts record that any of the speakers faced challenges to their assertions, unsolicited questions, rowdy interruptions, or other acts of unfriendliness during the course of their speeches. Wade Hampton, speaking at Rockford, did read as a part of his speech a letter allegedly written by a local veteran who called the South Carolinian a "darned old rebel," and threatened him with physical violence if he should appear at the agricultural exposition, but the friendly account by the Chicago Tribune describes no such overt acts during the time he was in Rockford..

The possibility that the audiences at the public meetings were carefully screened to avoid any unpleasantness may not be overlooked, but this hypothesis must be discarded when one considers that there were an estimated 10,000 persons on the grounds at Rockford to hear Hampton, all of whom had access to the speaking area; that Gordon spoke to audiences in Ohio of from 3000 to 5000 persons, and that Watterson's addresses to the Grand Army encampments, as well as his World's Fair oration, were in public places accessible to anyone who wished to enter. Such was also true of Hampton's open-air address at Auburn, and virtually all of the Decoration Day orations. The attendance at banquets and societies could, of course, be supervised by admitting members only, though such occasions were not likely to be the scene of rowdy demonstrations against the guest speaker.

Favorable Immediate Reactions to the Speeches

There is insufficient evidence to provide the basis for a section describing audience reaction to the individual ideas expressed in the speeches. A number of accounts, however, indicate the response

given by the audience at the conclusion of the speech. An ovation following a speech cannot be taken as prima facie evidence of the universal acceptance of the content of the speech. It does at least indicate that, for a majority of the audience, the favorable reaction to the speaker and/or the speech has overshadowed any negative predispositions which may have been present. The following summary indicates the responses to a number of speakers and their speeches as recorded by reporters:

Garnett Andrews.--His appearance at Boston Music Hall was greeted by "tremendous cheering."¹ "At his presence, and a call for three cheers, every man leaped to his feet and responded amid wild enthusiasm."² His expression of appreciation at being asked to join in the celebration of the nation's common heritage and to aid in destroying sectional animosity was "electrical in its effect."³

Simon B. Buckner.--At the Louisville G. A. R. Convention, where he expressed satisfaction that sectional sentiment was being converted into a national feeling and confided that he believed the politicians and not the soldiers had begun and prolonged the war, "he was cheered to the echo."⁴

John B. Gordon.--Addressing the Boston Merchants, Gordon praised the industrial development of the Northeast and warned that the South, with unsurpassed raw materials and water power, was preparing to challenge the leadership of industrial New England. "The governor's

¹New York Times, July 17, 1875.

²Boston Evening Transcript, June 18, 1875, p. 2

³Ibid., p. 1.

⁴Louisville Courier-Journal, September 12, 1895, p. 1.

response was felicitous."¹

During his Ohio swing of 1887, his appearance on the platform touched off the following ovation: "The great audience arose to its feet as one man and cheered, shouted, yelled, stamped feet, waved handkerchiefs, and threw hats in the air, renewing this demonstration again and again, for more than five minutes." His speech, which proclaimed that the South loved the Union because she had taken such a large part in its building, that the South had acted with honesty and integrity, that the lot of the Negro was tremendously improved under Southern leadership, and that national interests would best be served by overthrowing bloody-shirt politics, was equally acclaimed:

Every sentence or two throughout the speech was punctuated by cheers and applause. At times these noisy demonstrations of approval continued for three or four minutes, swelling up wave after wave, and making it impossible for the speaker to continue.

At the end of the speech, "the monster audience rose to its feet and uttered cheer after cheer of the most enthusiastic commendation, while those upon the platform crowded about the orator to shake his hand in congratulation. It was a scene of surpassing enthusiasm."²

Moving on the Cleveland, Gordon proclaimed that his life could stand the severest scrutiny, that his role in Negro betterment was attested by Negro leaders, and that the South had acted honorably in secession and at all times since. "He was frequently cheered during the course of his speech."³

¹Louisville Courier-Journal, May 31, 1899, p. 6.

²Cincinnati Enquirer, October 29, 1887, p. 5.

³Dayton Daily Journal, November 1, 1887, p. 1.

Upon Gordon's first presentation of his "Confederacy" lecture, "he was greeted by an outburst of applause that would have won any Confederate soldier to the Union side." The speech, a reminiscence about battles in the Civil War and the conduct of the soldiers on both sides, included extensive praise of Ulysses S. Grant and ended with a plea for continuing national solidarity and freedom from bitterness. At its conclusion, Gen. Daniel E. Sickles proposed a vote of thanks for Gordon, and the entire audience rose and gave it.¹ On the second presentation of the lecture, it was "applauded with heartiness from beginning to end." His declaration that if war should come again the former enemies would fight together "was greeted with frantic enthusiasm and it was many minutes before the cheering subsided sufficiently to allow the speaker to proceed."²

Henry W. Grady.—Upon being introduced to the New England Society, Grady received "three cheers and a tiger." The text of the speech, as published in the New York Tribune, the official proceedings of the society, and Raymond B. Nixon's biography of Grady, contains bracketed comments of audience reaction. Laughter is indicated as following his jokes and quips. He was applauded following his statement that Puritan and Cavalier had gradually lost their identity. His assertion that the typical American had come in the person of Abraham Lincoln received "long and continued applause," and upon reiteration of the idea there was "renewed applause." The statement that Lincoln's martyrdom "came as a fitting crown to a life consecrated from the cradle

¹New York Times, November 26, 1893, p. 5.

²St. Louis Post Dispatch, December 22, 1895, p. 15.

to human liberty" gained "loud and prolonged cheering." Grady's audience likewise applauded his assertion concerning the progress which the South had made since the war. His concluding demands as to whether the North would continue to erect barriers to thwart the South's desire for national unity were met with cries of "No! No!"¹ He sat down amid "great applause."²

At Boston three years later, Grady was introduced to the Merchants' Association, who responded with "cheering and applause which lasted several minutes." Grady here proclaimed that the idyllic quality of Southern life was marred only by the crushing burden of the race problem and by the insistence of the North that a speedy solution be found. Only the race question, he said, stood between North and South. Southerners knew the Negro best, he said, and pleaded that the South be allowed to work out the problem without outside interference. During an hour of speaking, he was interrupted twenty-one times by "shouts, cheers, and applause. The eyes of many in the great company were dimmed with tears as the last words of the glowing peroration fell from the lips of the speaker, and hardly had he finished when the audience arose en masse and joined in one great cheer."³

Clark Howell.--Upon concluding his address at the Peace Jubilee Banquet at Chicago, where he asserted that a mighty nation had emerged from the Civil War but that it had been sadly divided until the Spanish War provided the incentive for reunion, Howell was honored by the playing

¹Nixon, op. cit., pp. 240-50.

²New York Times, December 23, 1886, p. 1.

³Nixon, op. cit., p. 322.

of "Dixie," while "prolonged applause was his portion."¹

Lucius Lamar.--Lamar spoke at Nashua for nearly two hours, stating in the course of his speech that an apprehension in the North concerning the South's willingness to guarantee rights for all its citizens was keeping the country divided. He assured his listeners that the South had accepted all the terms of reconstruction willingly, and that the people were not resentful despite the terrible abuse and injustice they had been forced to bear. Despite his lengthy speech, he "retained the closest attention to the last; and then, as several times before there was [sic] loud calls for him to continue. The address . . . made a deep impression upon those who listened to it."²

Fitzhugh Lee.--Lee could hardly have asked a more enthusiastic reaction to his thanks for the hospitality of the Bostonians and his promise to carry back the spirit of good fellowship to Virginia. Following the speech,

. . . a perfect battle of applause arose from the vast audience. The men threw their hats in the air and yelled themselves hoarse while the ladies in the galleries waved their handkerchiefs and clapped their hands in patriotic fervor and sisterly affection.³

Speaking later at a banquet in his honor by the Thirteenth New York Regiment, Lee arose to receive "three cheers and a tiger," followed by the playing of "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia's Shore."⁴

Charles Marshall.--Marshall had just launched into his address at Grant's tomb concerning the greatness of Grant and the necessity for

¹Chicago Tribune, October 20, 1898, p. 1.

²Boston Daily Advertiser, March 7, 1875, p. 1.

³Boston Evening Transcript, June 18, 1875, p. 2.

⁴New York Times, February 10, 1883.

following his admonitions regarding sectional unity when rain interrupted the proceedings, but he was nonetheless "roundly cheered."¹

Alfred M. Waddell.--In the course of delivering his lecture on the Confederate soldier, Waddell decried the role of politicians in the war and reconstruction, commented that the South had fought bravely, accepted defeat unflinchingly, and was ready to rejoin the Union in the fullest sense. He received the usual frequent interruptions for applause, and "applause followed him from the platform."²

Henry Watterson.--The reaction to Watterson's speeches indicates that he also created a favorable impression. He told the veterans at the Dayton Soldiers' Home that there had been no wrong in the war, only an honest difference of opinion. Every veteran, he felt, should have government aid when needed, regardless of the side on which he fought. Despite political divisions, the speaker saw happy signs of a reunited country. He was "listened to with much attention by the audience, and his sentiments were frequently applauded." His discussion of the South's need for capital investment to develop her resources was evidently acceptable to the Banker's convention at Louisville, because they lauded him with three cheers, a tiger, and a rising vote of thanks.³ Before the New England Society, Watterson's remarks on the merger of Puritan and Cavalier into a new nationality were greeted with "round after round of applause, and repeated cheers."⁴

¹Ibid., May 31, 1892, p. 9.

²Ibid., May 4, 1878, p. 1.

³Louisville Courier-Journal, October 12, 1883, p. 1.

⁴Chicago Tribune, February 13, 1895, p. 1.

Watterson's eulogy of Lincoln frequently moved the audience to "enthusiastic applause," while several references concerning the martyred president produced "noisy demonstrations."¹

Joseph Wheeler.--This speaker received the most prolonged ovation of any of the reunion orators when he rose to address a G. A. R. Memorial Day celebration at Boston. "The applause was tumultuous; cheer upon cheer arose from thousands and it was nearly fifteen minutes before the General could make himself heard." His audience response following the speech was equally impressive, the listeners responding to the proclamation that reunion had finally been accomplished in the challenges of the Spanish War.²

Summary.--Despite the enthusiastic quality of some of these accounts and the restrained nature of others, all must be construed as indicating a total response to the reconciliation speeches more favorable than unfavorable. As noted above, an ovation does not necessarily indicate total acceptance of the contents of the speech, but does suggest that the speaker and/or the speech earned general approval of the listeners.

Unfavorable Reactions to Reconciliation Speaking

All the discovered adverse criticism of the reunion speeches came on succeeding days and weeks in newspapers and periodicals, rather than in the form of outbursts from audiences who heard the speeches. In all probability, the critical nature of many of the comments adversely

¹Ibid.

²Louisville Courier-Journal, May 31, 1899, p. 6.

affected the attitude of the secondary audiences who read the speeches or heard about them. Certainly the adverse reactions indicate that not all Northerners were capable of accepting the intellectual content of the addresses, however large an ovation the speech might receive. In some instances this criticism was effected by copying attacks on speakers made by Southern publications; more often it involved direct editorial comment. Following are some of the criticisms directed at reconciliation speaking:

Henry W. Grady.--Though the "New South" was more widely acclaimed than perhaps any other reunion speeches, it likewise came in for negative comment. The Chicago Tribune charged that the sentiments expressed in the New England Society speech were highly inconsistent with Grady's introduction of Jefferson Davis at a Confederate rally in Atlanta the previous spring. The speech was also attacked on the Senate floor, where John J. Ingalls of Kansas asked:

When was that orator sincere? When did he speak the sentiments, the feelings and convictions of the Southern people, when he delivered that oration on the 1st of May, 1886, in Atlanta, in the presence of applauding thousands, or when he went up to the New England Dinner, in December of the same year, and spilled oil and wine all over the American people?¹

Neither were the comments concerning Grady's address to the Boston Merchants all laudatory. After praising the speech as "one of the masterpieces of eloquence in the English language," the Boston Pilot added acidly:

Never did oratory cover up the weak points of a repulsive cause more splendidly. When all is said and done about it, the burden of Mr. Grady's eloquence means the re-enslavement socially, if not legally, and forever, of the millions of black

¹Quoted in Nixon, op. cit., pp. 250ff.

Americans in the South.¹

On the editorial page of the same issue, the speech was described as

pleasant to the ear; but unsatisfactory to the judgment and hopeless to the heart. Mr. Grady, voicing the Southern whites, offers love and union to the North, but the conditions, however wreathed with lovely flowers of speech, is the suppression of the legitimate rights of the Southern blacks.²

Most of the Republican papers elsewhere in the country are described as being quite critical of the speech, except for such moderate publications as the Springfield Republican.³

Wade Hampton.--The Auburn speech of Wade Hampton came in for a considerable amount of criticism because of its alleged inconsistency:

The drawback of Gov. Hampton's speech at Auburn is the impossibility of accepting it literally without doing violence to truth. Take it just as it stands, and nothing could be more satisfactory. Order reigns. The races are reconciled. The Democratic wolf reposes with the Republican lamb and feeds it generously. Strangers are welcomed, whatever their politics. Especial pains are taken for the benefit of the colored population, their education, social elevation, and general well-being. Altogether, the condition of South Carolina is beautiful. And to make the matter still more marvelous, the sudden transformation of the State from a pandemonium to a paradise has been effected simply and solely to the installation in favor of Mr. Hampton and his friends.

We do not impute to Mr. Hampton a deliberate intention to mislead the North, for whose enlightenment this speech was delivered. . . .

The fine sentiments which Mr. Hampton dispenses at Auburn are unheeded in his own state. . . . Mr. Hampton's vision, then, can be received only in a dim, prophetic sense, with which the stern present unpleasantly conflicts.⁴

The speech merited still another Times editorial:

¹December 21, 1889, p. 1.

²Ibid., p. 4.

³Nixon, op. cit., p. 326.

⁴New York Times, June 22, 1877, p. 3.

Wade Hampton . . . for six long months posed himself on the South Carolina Volcano and continually said "Be Calm, Be Calm." The diffident, taciturn and unselfish Hampton has been here, and nobody knew it. How he could have got to Auburn from South Carolina without passing through New-York is not clear. Therefore, we conclude that he has been here, since nobody can go anywhere without going through New-York. There were no fire-works, no free lunches at the Manhattan and no procession. In Auburn, where governors are scarcer than they are in New York, he was heard. He made a speech, celebrating the glory of Gen Shields in a neat autobiography of Wade Hampton, and a soul-stirring account of Wade Hampton's trials and triumphs in South Carolina. With that intimate acquaintance with the Creator that distinguishes a true son of the sunny South, he called God to witness that he could do various and sundry things in South Carolina; and he referred to his genial climate and fertile soil in terms that were well calculated to draw tears from a brass knocker.¹

David Key.---The address of Postmaster-General David Key at Bennington, Vermont, also received a double-barreled blast from the Times:

. . . the Postmaster General made a speech, in the course of which he used the phrase "erring brothers" as applied to Southern rebels, of whom he was one. If any man has a right to characterize the rebels, or ex-rebels, of the South in fitting terms, Mr. Key certainly has that right. A rebel of the rebels, a Democrat of the Democracy, Southern born and bred, and at one time a chosen representative of a considerable constituency, Mr. Key may be said to be a fair type of a certain subdivision of the American people. His Bennington speech, which was good-humored and jocular, has thrown the talkative South into hysterics. One says that this is eating too much humble pie. Another thinks that it is groveling in the dust in a prefatory and unnecessary manner. Still another says "Erring be hanged! Southerners will not be the brethren of any living people on such terms. They do not admit that they erred." That is to say, the Lost Cause is still a righteous one, and is only held in abeyance until more propitious days. For if it be right and righteous, its disaster can be only temporary. Says this incorrigible; "If we are to be brothers you must admit that we were right in the rebellion."

It must be distinctly understood that the Southern man who admits that the rebellion was wrong and a failure ceases to be worthy to be called a son of the South. In this category we find Mr. Key, and he is accordingly derided and condemned. It was treachery to the South, the Democratic South, that he should be willing to assume charge of the United States postal

¹Ibid., p. 4.

service in the Administration of a Republican President. It is infamous that he should admit that as a rebel he was on the wrong side.¹

Henry Watterson.--Two of Watterson's speeches apparently received adverse comment. One was his Lincoln lecture; the other his address to the Boston Merchants. The New York Times suggested mildly that perhaps Watterson was historically inaccurate in his account of Lincoln's negotiations with Alexander Stephens concerning an armistice.² After a brief review of the Boston speech, Harper's Weekly commented as follows:

Mr. Watterson holds that the separation of races is practically as absolute in Boston as in Charleston, yet that the separation in the South is even more natural, because the "average black man" in Boston is as different intellectually from the "average black" in Alabama as Frederick Douglass from Topsy in Uncle Tom's Cabin.

Mr. Watterson thinks only pressure from without to unite the Negro vote for a party makes the solid South, and that the withdrawal of that pressure would at once divide both the white and the colored vote and with that natural division eight-box laws and tissue ballots and the shot-gun policy would disappear. This, in his judgment, is the only solution to the problem.

Mr. Watterson is undoubtedly right that the settlement must be finally intrusted to the communities directly interested. But acquiescence in that conclusion would be much more general and willing if those communities showed plainly a determination not only to treat the colored citizen kindly as an inferior, but to protect his political equality under the law.³

Summary.--The discovered denunciations of reconciliation speeches are limited in number. While Grady's speeches in New York and Boston as well as Hampton's Auburn address, were rather sharply criticized, comments on Watterson's Lincoln lecture and his Boston speech were so

¹Ibid., August 22, 1877, p. 4.

²May 15, 1895, p. 3.

³"Mr. Watterson's Speech," XXXIV (October 11, 1890), 787. .

mild as almost to defy designation as adverse criticism. It is true that Ben Hill was personally attacked by the New York Times and New York Tribune before and after the address to the Democratic Union, as was John B. Gordon during his visit to Ohio by the Dayton Daily Journal and the Cleveland Leader, but in neither case was the attack directed against the speeches. Rather it concerned the conduct of the speakers in their home states. Probably this tended to weaken his ethical appeal with the larger audiences who read the speeches.

Appraisal of Probable Response to Speeches in Which The Speakers Sought Specific Overt Actions

A few of the Southern reconciliation orators in the North sought a more tangible response than an emotionalized predisposition in favor of reconciliation. Such speeches were Gordon's three speeches during his Ohio tour of 1887, and his Boston speech, Grady's New York and Boston addresses, Hill's New York speech, Lamar's speech at Nashua, and Watterson's talks to the bankers' convention and to the Boston merchants. Five of the speeches--Gordon's Ohio addresses, Hill's Democratic Union speech and Lamar's Nashua address--were frankly designed to aid the Democratic slates in the states in which they were given. Watterson spoke to the bankers' convention in an attempt to encourage new investment in the South, as did Gordon to the Boston Commercial Club. Grady's speeches in New York and Boston were designed in part to forestall a bill calling for the federal supervision of elections. Watterson's Boston talk had a like purpose. Speaking in New York, Grady also sought to reassure uneasy investors that their money was in no danger. The first group of speeches to be considered relate to political campaigns.

Campaign-type speeches.---John B. Gordon delivered three speeches in Ohio in 1887 on the eve of state elections, at Cincinnati on October 28, at Columbus on the following evening, and at Cleveland on November 1.¹ His ostensible purpose was to aid the Democratic candidate, Thomas Powell, in overcoming his Radical opponent, J. B. Foraker. In Cincinnati Gordon received his largest and most enthusiastic reception. The city and its environs, Hamilton County, had Democratic leanings, perhaps because of the proximity of the area to Kentucky, while the upstate cities were solidly Republican. Gordon's speech at Cincinnati came before the concerted attacks on his character and conduct began in the Dayton Journal and Cleveland Leader. In the election the week following his visit to the Ohio cities came the opportunity for a test of his rhetorical effectiveness. In Hamilton county, the front-running members of the Republican ticket received pluralities over their Democratic and Independent opponents of approximately 12,000 votes, while Foraker ran ahead of Powell by only 6730 votes, indicating a defection of over 5000 votes from the Republican gubernatorial candidate. The Cincinnati correspondent of the New York Times indicated that local party leaders attributed this to Foraker's injection of the Southern issue into the campaign.² Thus, it is entirely possible that Gordon's speech in answer to Foraker's "bloody shirt" attacks contributed either first-hand or in printed form to the dissatisfaction among the more liberal Republicans which resulted in "scratching" of more than 5000 ballots, though a definite causal relationship cannot be established.

¹Details of these speeches may be found in Chapters II and IV.

²November 10, 1887, p. 5.

In Columbus, as well as at Cleveland, however, Foraker ran virtually even with the rest of the ticket, piling up a larger vote than he had done on his previous election.¹ There is therefore no indication that Gordon's speeches in these places had any efficacy whatever in shifting votes away from Foraker. A possible reason for this is that in the two upstate speeches, Gordon was so busy defending himself from personal attack by the Republican press that he had little opportunity to carry the onslaught to Foraker as he had done in his confident and aggressive Cincinnati address. The Republican organizations in Columbus and Cleveland were indicated as being particularly strong in virtually solid Republican territory, and presumably the party members were less likely to be swayed by appeals from a Southern Democrat here than in Southern Ohio.

Concerning Gordon's Ohio trip, it may be said in summary that the speaker may have aided in causing the defection of some Cincinnati Republicans from Foraker, though no evidence is available to indicate that he aided the cause of the Democratic candidate, Powell, in the upstate Ohio cities.

Another campaign-type speech was that of Ben Hill to the Democratic Union in New York City October 6, 1868. The effect of this speech is hardly measurable in terms of votes, since the major city and state offices went almost solidly Republican. Furthermore, Hill spoke to an audience attending a Democratic political rally and evidently composed entirely of members of his own party, who would have voted the Democratic ticket regardless of his speech. His speech was not directed

¹Ibid.

toward influencing votes in any particular race as were Gordon's Ohio addresses.

Haywood Pearce furnishes an analysis of the background of the speech. Hill had determined to embark on a stumping tour of the North at his own expense, but was apparently dissuaded by New York Democratic leaders from making more than one speech. Instead he wrote a series of letters to the New York Tribune and the Times defending his conduct and attempting to present the side of the Southern whites in the riots which had recently occurred at Camilla, Georgia. As a result of this correspondence he became the victim of an editorial and letter-writing attack in both newspapers, which probably lessened his ethical appeal.¹ The speech itself, carried in the Republican New York papers amid a setting of anti-Southern and anti-Democratic comment, probably aroused little enthusiasm among readers of the speech who were politically uncertain, so that the total effect of the speech as heard and read contributed little to the Democratic cause in New York.

The speech of Lucius Lamar at Nashua, New Hampshire, on March 6, 1875, occurred at a Democratic rally on the week preceding the annual March 14 election in the state. Like Gordon's addresses, it did not discuss local issues, but dealt in generalities on the accomplishments of the Democratic party. Unlike Gordon's speeches, however, Lamar's effort was not focalized on any of the state races.

Beginning in 1871, New Hampshire left the Republican camp for the first time since the organization of the party and elected a full slate of Democratic candidates.² In 1872 the majority of elected

¹Pearce, op. cit., pp. 194-99.

²New York Times, March 13, 1871, p. 4.

officers were Republican, but the margin of Republican victory was very narrow. The Republican victory was repeated in 1873, but the Democrats won by a comfortable majority in 1874. Weston, the Democratic gubernatorial candidate defeated McGutchins, the Republican, by 35,608 to 34,143.¹ This shifting rivalry meant that 1875 would be another hotly-contested election. This time the Republicans succeeded in electing most of their candidates by an insignificant majority, with Cheney, the Republican, in the annual governor's race, besting the Democrat, Roberts, by 39,293 to 38,121.²

Considering the insignificance of the majorities which had decided the elections of the previous four years, it is probable that Lamar's speech at Nashua did not materially affect the outcome of the 1875 election. There is no evidence to indicate that his appearance caused the Democrats to lose the margin of approximately 1500 votes which they held in the 1874 election. The outcome rather appears attributable to a heavy vote in which the Republicans did the superior job of canvassing.³

Speeches on Southern investment.--Three of the speeches sought to encourage the investment of capital in Southern industry. These were Gordon's speech to the Commercial Club and Watterson's address to the bankers at Louisville, as well as Grady's New England Society effort. In assessing the probable effect of these speeches urging increased investment in the South, it is well to consider some expressions

¹Ibid., March 16, 1874, p. 2.

²Ibid., March 17, 1875, p. 3.

³Ibid.

of the Northern attitude toward Southern industrial development. Almost immediately following the war, Harper's Weekly called for the resumption of economic relations between the sections, proclaiming: "It is by actual immigration and social and industrial intercourse that the hostility springing from separation and ignorance will be removed."¹ Considering the matter on a more personal basis, however, another writer objected:

No Northern man would be justified in giving up a permanent and profitable business at the North in the hope of securing a larger return for his money by investing it in the South. . . . I am convinced that the inhabitants of the Southern states today, if permitted to do as they please, would vote themselves out of the Union with even greater unanimity than in 1860.²

This analysis may be contrasted with an expression twelve years later:

It is a very easy thing to hate somebody, but the luxury is expensive. The hatred that has existed between the North and the South for so many years has cost hundreds of thousands of lives and money that cannot be computed. . . .

It is time that people of the country brought this matter down to a business basis and coolly and carefully calculated the cost of dissention in the future--how much it will cost for one year, for ten.³

That some Yankees saw the advantages of Southern investment is evident from this conclusion to an article on the industrial and agricultural development written for the Nation in 1891:

The advance of one section of the United States means a step forward for all. Southern progress stands for national growth, as such. Indeed, much of the industrial

¹"Our Maps of the Southern States," Harper's Weekly, X (January 6, 1866), 3.

²"The Future Relations of the North and South," Nation, II (January 18, 1866), 80.

³"Cost of Dissention," Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper, XLV (February 2, 1878), 370.

activity at the South revealed by the eleventh census would have been impossible without Northern capital, experience, and enterprise.¹

Evidence that there was still some reluctance as late as 1894 to invest wholeheartedly in Southern enterprises is revealed by the following opinion:

A convention of Southerners was recently held in Washington to consider what steps might be taken to the end of promoting Southern business, and various ways were discussed, such as a permanent exhibition of Southern products at the seat of the national government, to bring the resources of the Southern country to the knowledge of the world, and thus to attract to the South capital as well as immigration. While such a policy of advertising is well enough . . . yet it does not touch the main obstacles that stand in the way of a more rapid influx of capital and immigration into the South. . . .

Capital . . . still hesitated to trust itself to the social conditions and the currents of opinion widely believed to be prevailing in the South, or at least in certain parts of it, and to the fact that instead of the attractions, other than agricultural and industrial opportunities, which draw immigration to other places, there are certain tendencies to the social life of the South which make people who might otherwise be inclined to seek new homes there doubt whether they would find there those advantages and comforts which other parts of the country present.

The truth is that many capitalists are still timid as to investments of money in many of the Southern States because they do not see there those guarantees of the safety of life and property which they find elsewhere.²

Any speculations concerning the effect of the addresses of Gordon and Watterson on the increase in Southern investment must be entered into with caution. It is true that industrial development in the South increased tremendously between 1880 and 1890 and that because of the limited investment capital in the South most of the money for development of the industries came from the North. Georgia, the home of Grady,

¹"The Prosperous South," Nation, LII (May 7, 1891), 375.

²"Development of the South," Harper's Weekly, XXXVIII, (September 29, 1894), 914.

Gordon, and Hill, will serve as an example of the expansion which took place. In 1880 there were 3593 manufacturing establishments, representing a capital investment of \$20,672,410,¹ while in 1890 the number of plants had increased to 4285, with an investment of \$56,921,580.² The assessed valuation of real estate in Georgia in 1880 was \$139,983,941,³ which had increased a decade later to \$225,054,915.⁴ Two such powerful fiscal organizations as the Boston Commercial Club and the American Bankers Association could reasonably be expected to have contributed in this capital development, but whether the rate of investment was accelerated by the messages of Gordon and Watterson cannot be determined. It seems reasonable to assume that their messages helped to overcome some of the reticence to invest in Southern enterprises.

Speeches designed to forestall election supervision bills.--

Allied with the problem of encouraging investment was that of reassuring the people of the North that the South was politically and socially stable and that capital already invested was secure. This assurance was complicated by the threat of a "force bill" concerning federal election supervision in the South. The Republicans' defeats in state and national elections in 1883 had made many Republicans doubly determined to return to power in the 1886 Congressional elections. It was apparent that regaining control of the Congress would be dependent on a strong Southern

¹Compendium to the 10th Census, Part II (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1883), 1136.

²Report on Manufacturing Industries, 11th Census, Part I (Washington: 1895), 22.

³Compendium to the 10th Census, Part II, op. cit., 1524.

⁴Report on Wealth, Debt, Tax, 11th Census, Part II (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1895), 22.

Negro vote. To do this, the Republicans knew that their only hope was in a bill calling for the federal supervision of elections. Senator John Sherman denounced the "strange turn of events" by which the South went solidly Republican and James G. Blaine charged that the South was in power only by the outrage of the law. The Stalwarts were likewise angered by the appointment of ex-Confederates in Cleveland's cabinet and the votes of some Southern congressmen against veterans' benefit bills.¹ Repeated threats about election supervision formed the motivation for Grady's address to the New England Society in 1886, though the bill remained potential during the year.²

The subject once again became crucial in 1889, when William Henry Harrison, in his message to Congress on December 3, 1889, urged the adoption of a federal election bill, and Henry Cabot Lodge began drafting such a bill. Grady's speech to the Boston Merchants on December 13, 1889, and Watterson's address in October of the following year were attempts to forestall the legislation by interpreting the Southern treatment of the Negro in favorable terms before groups of powerful New Englanders.

The protests of these Southerners formed a part of the agitation against such legislation carried on by E. L. Godkin in the Nation and George W. Curtis in Harper's Weekly, together with Democrats and many moderate Republicans. When introduced, Lodge's bill was surprisingly moderate in tone and called for federal investigation by representatives

¹Dewey, op. cit., p. 164. The Stalwarts, a wing of the Republican party which held distrust of the South as a political tenet, took special offense at the cabinet appointments.

²Nixon, op. cit., pp. 237ff.

of both parties in any district where five hundred voters petitioned federal authorities. The bill passed the House on July 2, 1890, and died from neglect in the Senate. Senator George F. Hoar, sponsor of the bill in the upper house, significantly blamed the businessmen of the Northeast for much of the agitation which defeated the bill, and Lodge concurred in this opinion, as did Senator John Cameron of Pennsylvania.¹ The opinion of these men strongly suggests that the speeches of Grady and Watterson to two prominent Northeast organizations, whose members were directly engaged in financial and commercial transactions in the South and whose profits would have been affected by any interruption in Southern society, may have played a part in the pressure brought to bear upon the Senate against the bill. Included among the members of the New England Society who heard Grady were such prominent businessmen as financiers J. Pierpont Morgan and John H. Inman, manufacturer Seth Thomas, and H. M. Flagler, builder of Southern railroads.²

General Summary

The tensions of war and reconstruction appear to have led to a psychological reaction in the minds of the American people which manifested itself in an exaggerated emphasis on symbolic acts of reconciliation. Some of the schemes for "shaking hands across the bloody chasm" were so extreme as to be rejected by the Northern people, while others equally novel were eagerly accepted. The Southern orators who responded

¹Buck, op. cit., pp. 280ff.

²New York Times, December 22, 1886, p. 1.

to invitations for reunion speeches in the North aided this compulsive desire for peace and good will by appearing and speaking words designed to promote reconciliation. In every case the immediate audience responded enthusiastically to the Southerners. This constructive effect may have been retarded to a limited degree by some unfavorable editorial comments on a few of the speeches.

Some of the speeches sought tangible responses. There is some evidence that John B. Gordon's Cincinnati speech accomplished measurable effects, but this is not true of the other campaign speeches. Authors of federal election bills blamed defeat of the measures on resistance from Northeastern businessmen. Southerners spoke to groups of these same businessmen on lack of need for such legislation by describing the settled and democratic spirit of the South. A direct causal relationship between the assurances of the Southerners concerning fair treatment of the Negro and the defeat of the bills cannot be established, but the speeches were probably a contributing factor in the thinking which led to anti-force bill agitation. Another factor cited by one of the authors of the legislation was the pressure brought to bear by interested Northeast investors.

It may be said of the movement in general that it probably made a positive contribution by providing focal points around which reunion sentiment might be built.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Suggestions of historians and speech critics led to an investigation of Southern reconciliation speakers in the North following the Civil War. No previous studies had been undertaken concerning the movement. The temporal limitation of 1868-1899 embraces the bulk of the movement. Only speakers connected with the Confederate government or military forces or those whose homes were in the former Confederate states were considered. The study was limited to speeches delivered outside the old Confederacy because of the challenge presented to the speakers in addressing potentially hostile audiences.

The method employed was to examine collections of speeches, history books, periodicals, government documents, and other sources for information concerning speakers, speeches, occasions, and parallel historical developments. This material was arranged in a form which revealed such matters as the nature and extent of the movement, the individuals involved, where and when the speeches were given, principal themes employed, modes of proof and techniques of four of the most prominent speakers, and assessment of probable influence of the speakers, based on audience attitude and the attempts of the speakers to gain specific ends.

In all, twenty-six Southern speakers were discovered to have given in the North at least fifty-nine speeches conforming to the limitations placed on the study. The predominant motive of the speakers seemed to be the promotion of a general feeling of friendship and good will, though Henry Grady, Wade Hampton, Benjamin Hill, John B. Gordon, and Henry Watterson had additional motivations. These included the encouragement of investment in Southern enterprises and the avoidance of punitive federal legislation.

Speakers came from South Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee. Six came from Virginia, while five each were from Georgia and South Carolina, three were from Mississippi, two from Alabama and one from Tennessee. Five of the speakers were governors, six were senators, and six served as United States Representatives. Six speakers held cabinet positions. Seven were journalists and editors of some note, while others gained fame as lecturers, soldiers, and educators, and one became a supreme court justice. Five of the speakers led quiet and undistinguished lives following the war.

Nine Northern states played host to Southern reunion orators. Twenty-nine speeches were heard in New York; thirteen occurred in Massachusetts, seven each took place in Illinois and Pennsylvania; four were heard in Kentucky and Ohio, respectively, while Vermont, New Hampshire, and Tennessee were host to one each. The speeches in Kentucky and Tennessee were presented before "imported" Northern audiences.

Chronological distribution of the speeches was between October 5, 1868, and December 22, 1899. Ten speeches occurred in 1895, while

eight were heard in 1875. Distribution over the remainder of the period was fairly even, though no speeches were presented during thirteen scattered years of the period. Perhaps 100,000 persons were estimated to have heard the speeches, though anything like an exact accounting of the auditors is impossible. Watterson, Hampton, and Gordon addressed significantly larger numbers of persons than did the other men in the movement. The nature of the occasions on which speeches were delivered and the prominence of the speakers themselves often meant that the speeches were widely reproduced in the newspapers and magazines of the time, reaching a large but undetermined number of readers. The occasions on which speeches were heard included centennials, Decoration Day celebrations, commercial and financial organization meetings, fairs, political rallies, veterans' organizations, and public lectures, as well as other miscellaneous occasions.

The themes most commonly employed by Southern reconciliation speakers included the following: The South has abandoned loyalty to the Confederacy and has become once more a loyal and devoted part of the Union; the South did not discredit herself by participating in the Civil War, because she fought for what she believed; politicians are attempting to prevent reunion for selfish reasons; the South merits self-government; the Negro is making steady progress under white supervision; Ulysses S. Grant was a great and noble leader. Less frequently recurring ideas were that the war resulted from a Constitutional defect and that a foreign war would immediately reunite the country. By 1890, tentative solutions had been provided for many of the problems which had vexed the country during the three decades after the war, and speakers were much more prone to talk in patriotic generalities during

the last ten years of the century than they were to discuss issues.

A common logical technique was the enthymeme, a rhetorical syllogism in which one of the premises is left unstated, with reasoning from example nearly as widely used. More limited use was made of analogy and comparison, argument from authority, and causal relationship. More than half of the speakers sought to establish their ethical character while addressing their audiences. This was usually done through renunciation of loyalty to the Confederacy, while references to military or political prowess and to the speaker's purity of motive were also prevalent. The audience was frequently praised as a means of gaining a favorable response from the listeners. Some of the speakers sought to arouse scorn and contempt against carpetbaggers and Radical politicians. Emotionally-charged anecdotes were also utilized in rendering the audience predisposed to the speaker's message.

Four of the outstanding speakers were Wade Hampton, Fitzhugh Lee, John B. Gordon, and Henry Watterson. Hampton's addresses included speeches to a National Guard reunion in Auburn, New York, a fair in Rockford, Illinois, and a monument dedication in Chicago. All three orations began with lengthy references to the occasion, though no other consistent aspect of arrangement was evident. Hampton used causal arguments, examples, and general propositions in about equal proportions. His ethical proof centered mostly on references to his own ability in war and politics. Praise of his audience was also a popular ethical technique. An emotional response was sought against his critics and political opponents. Hampton's speaking style was characterized by a general lack of specific language, some obscure words, and a tendency

to over-modification of nouns, which may have detracted from the economy of his style. A minimum amount of figurative language was apparent.

Fitzhugh Lee spoke at the Boston Centennial, at a reception and banquet in his honor in New York, and before the Philadelphia Hibernian Society. He spoke of himself as a symbol of the thinking of Virginia, but did not try to represent his ideas as expressing the thinking of the entire South. All of his speeches in the North were compact in arrangement, with close adherence to a central theme. All contained an introduction, a thesis with supporting material, and three of the four speeches had a formal conclusion. Lee made limited use of logical materials in his reunion speaking. Causal arguments and general propositions were employed only occasionally. He spurned ethical appeals almost entirely, apparently relying on his audience's knowledge of his character and reputation. Praise of his audience was his only attempt at establishing good will. Lee's style is notable for its use of specific language and for economy achieved through short and direct sentences employing simple language. Suggestiveness was achieved through metaphorical constructions.

John B. Gordon spoke in the North to the Boston Merchants Association, at a reception in Boston, on three occasions during a campaign tour of Ohio, at a reunion at Gettysburg, and at a public lecture given several times in the North. Gordon began all his speeches with a reference to the occasion, but there is no other consistent pattern in the arrangement of the speeches. He seldom used authority in supporting arguments. Reasoning from example was his chief logical device. Reasoning by means of analogy and comparison, as well as causal reasoning, was

also used extensively. Gordon used ethical proofs rather consistently, usually referring to his motives and the meritorious nature of his past actions, and to the admirable qualities of his audience. His emotional appeals were built around attempts to arouse indignation against his enemies and praise of abstract virtues such as bravery, loyalty, virtue, and patriotism. Gordon's style was somewhat hampered by a lack of care in choosing colorful and exact words. A fondness for repetition and overuse of parallel construction may have limited the force of his language. His speeches were rather notable for their ease of expression, achieved through direct address, attempts to relate the audience to the discourse, and idiomatic language.

Henry Watterson was by far the most prolific of the Southern reconciliation orators. He gave two public lectures which involved reconciliatory themes, addresses to a bankers' convention, the Boston Merchants Association, the New England Society in New York, and the Grand Army of the Republic, two Decoration Day speeches, and a dedicatory address at the opening of the Chicago World's Fair. All of these speeches began with a lengthy reference to the occasion. In some of the addresses, a definite theme was developed throughout, while in others there was no attempt to support a single idea. Most of Watterson's logical reasoning was centered around general propositions, though he also employed analogy and comparison extensively. Reasoning from example was used little and no instance of reasoning from authority was discovered. Watterson did not hesitate to use ethical proof, proclaiming the superiority of his ancestry, declaring the soundness of his motives, and striving to identify his interests with those of his listeners. Praise of his audience also aided in establishing ethical proof. Watterson-

employed a style characterized by exactness and color, with words adapted to the nature of his audience. Language was highly suggestive, with figures of speech appearing frequently. Informal words and direct address gave a considerable ease to his style.

An attempt to assess the influence of Southern reconciliation speakers as a group required a preliminary examination of the attitude of the North toward reconciliation and toward Southerners who spoke on reunion themes. Political differences apparently functioned as the chief barrier to reconciliation, but after the decline of "bloody shirt" politics, reunion proceeded at a more rapid rate. The tensions of war and reconstruction produced an emotional reaction in the minds of the people which led to a variety of symbolic acts of reconciliation, including the reunion speeches of Southerners. The appearance of these ex-Rebels served a definite role in reconciliation because of the enthusiasm with which the speakers were greeted by their audiences. Unfavorable reactions to the speeches did not occur as a part of the speaking situations, but in a number of cases highly critical accounts appeared in the press following the speeches. In some cases the speakers sought tangible responses to their speeches. Examples of this type of speech included Gordon's Ohio addresses, Hill's speech at New York and Hampton's at Nashua, all of which were calculated to influence voting. Only Gordon's Cincinnati speech may be said to have produced measurable results. The attempts of Grady and Watterson to forestall a federal election bill probably contributed to the agitation which led to the defeat of the bill.

Conclusions

In addition to the material presented in the above recapitulation,

the writer has reached a number of generalizations regarding Southern reconciliation speaking in the North.

I. The efforts of the Southern orators probably made an important contribution to the restoration of good will between North and South. The speakers did not operate apart from the vital social, political, and economic forces which were active in effecting reconciliation. Rather, Southern reconciliation speaking functioned as a medium of expression for such important issues of the day as the trustworthiness of the former Rebels, the question of whether politicians who talked of the necessity of making the South suffer for her act of rebellion could be more accurately described as statesmen or demagogues, the soundness of investing money in Southern enterprises, and the attitudes of the South toward rights for the freedmen. The appearance of Southerners to discuss these questions in the North presented a unique opportunity for the reconciling of Northern views with Southern opinion.

The proportions of the movement also give some indication of its significance. At least twenty of the Southerners who appeared in the capacity of reunion orators were probably well-known to their audience, either for their military exploits or for post-war activities, and as such presumably carried a considerable weight of authority in their utterances. The fact that as many as 100,000 persons attended these reunion occasions, and that publications such as the Chicago Tribune, New York Herald, New York Times, Springfield Republican, Harper's Weekly, Nation, and Independent carried texts or accounts of most of the speeches indicates that a significant number of Northerners were exposed to the ideas presented by the speakers. The Southerners

also appeared at fifty-nine separate occasions at which Northerners might hear and express approval of professions of good will.

II. The movement did not represent an organized effort on the part of any reconciliation society to arrange tours and bookings for Southerners in the North. Though many of the men were military or political associates, and Wade Hampton, Lucius Lamar, and John B. Gordon appear to have been close friends, no evidence suggests that they made a conscious effort to canvass the North systematically in behalf of Southern ideals. Their only tie as a group seems to have been their mutual desire to reestablish a feeling of nationalism and unity. Except in the case of the public lectures of Gordon and Watterson, the Southerners were apparently dependent upon local sponsorship in the North for the expression of their ideas. Other evidence of the spontaneity of the movement was the absence of any official newspaper or of printed reconciliation literature.

III. Most reconciliation speakers avoided careful logical argument and relied largely on the discussion of general propositions which were palatable to the listeners. Only three speeches contain a heavy weight of logical material and these occur in the first twenty years of the movement. Ben Hill, addressing a New York audience in 1868, Wade Hampton before the Winnebago Agricultural Association in 1877, and John B. Gordon in Ohio in 1887 made the most concerted effort to support their contentions logically, by means of examples, authority, and causal reasoning. With few exceptions, attempts at an incisive intellectual analysis were not met with enthusiasm. Grady's 1886 speech to the New England Society, the content of which demonstrated little except that the speaker was a skilled raconteur and a master of oral

style, was almost universally praised, while his "Race Problem" speech in Boston three years later gained him considerable criticism for proclaiming that the subservient position of the Southern Negro would be maintained in the future because it was the best method of handling the problem. Whether the Southern orators realized that their hosts desired to hear only sentiments with which they could agree, or whether later speakers profited from the experience of Hill in New York and Hampton at Auburn, they chose for the most part to deal in platitudinous generalities about the loyalty and industriousness of the South.

IV. An examination of the acts of reconciliation of which the Southern speeches were a part reveals the surpassing faith of many nineteenth-century Americans in abstraction and symbolism. Time after time, well-meaning individuals sought to reunite the sections by the symbolism of a handshake, the spiking of a cannon, or the erection of a monument. These self-conscious efforts to effect reunion began soon after the war and were still being executed at the end of the century. Another aspect of this faith in symbolism is indicated by the statement of some of the Southern speakers, enthusiastically seconded by Northern listeners, that if only another war could be fought so that ex-Rebels and old Union men could fight and die shoulder to shoulder, then the purest manifestation of reunion would be reached. War came, of course, and the conditions were fulfilled, but one cannot help wondering whether as much nationalistic spirit would have resulted from the same conflict in 1868 as thirty years later, when most of the areas of sectional conflict had been either resolved or modified. Had it not been for the belief in abstraction as the key to a change of heart, probably most of the Southerners would not have had

the opportunity of appearing before Northern audiences to serve as a focal point of reunion sentiment.

V. It seems evident after considering the extent of reconciliation speaking that previous individual studies of participants in the movement have obscured the true nature and extent of the movement as a whole. It is apparent that Paul H. Buck possesses the most nearly accurate estimate of the dimensions of the movement. In his Road to Reunion, noted as the genesis of this study, he mentions Gordon, Grady, Hampton, Lamar, Waddell, Watterson, and Alexander H. Stephens as having participated in reconciliatory efforts.¹ Buck does not state categorically that the speakers he names are the only individuals in the movement, but he fails to mention others in his admirable study of reconciliation. Misconceptions about the Southern speakers are especially evident where the speaker's reputation is based largely upon one or two speeches. Wirt Cate, biographer of Lucius Lamar, proclaims that only Lamar and Grady deserved places in the reconciliatory speaking movement, the one because of his eulogy of Charles Sumner and the other for his "New South" speech. J. W. Lee and Edna Turpin, obviously eager to expand the Grady myth, both assign him the only position of importance in reunion ranks. Even Raymond B. Nixon, though he mentions Lamar, Hill, and Watterson as reconciliation speakers along with Grady, dismisses them because Lamar and Hill had spoken too soon and Watterson "was of much too contentious a nature." Marvin G. Bauer, a rhetorical critic, lists the same four individuals in the movement as does Nixon, but also places Grady at the pinnacle. Unquestionably Lamar's eulogy

¹Stephens is included because of his Congressional address on the occasion of the unveiling of Carpenter's portrait of Abraham Lincoln.

and Grady's "New South" are highly significant utterances in the process of reconciliation, but to indicate that either of them touched off a wildfire of peace and good will which swept away the last vestiges of hate and mistrust is to reveal a lack of appreciation of the whole fabric of reconciliation. Reunion was a painfully slow process. Probably it is still going on. It required not only the voices of the Gradys, Lamars, Hills, and Wattersons, but the efforts of many other men of greater and less fame, speaking in city halls and cemeteries over a period of many years as a part of the great social, political, and economic forces which aided in reunion.

VI. A final conclusion growing from the study is that Southern reconciliation speeches comprise a body of literature which throws important light on the total process of reunion. Within the context of historical materials on reconstruction and reconciliation, the data on speakers, speeches, audiences, occasions, and reactions expands the limit of understanding about how reunion was accomplished. To the student of public address, the materials provide the opportunity for more detailed studies of individuals and groups within the movement. As such, therefore, the texts of speeches should be made readily available to the speech scholar and the historian. While Grady's "New South," Hill's address to the Democratic Union, and Gordon's "Confederacy" lecture are contained in a number of collections of American orations, many other excellent speeches are presently available only in newspapers or in obscure books and pamphlets. Such speeches include Alfred Waddell's "The Confederate Soldier," Lucius Lamar's Nashua address, Henry Watterson's eloquent Memorial Day orations, "The Nation's Dead," and "God's Promise Redeemed," as well as his lecture on Abraham Lincoln.

These speeches form the substance of a significant effort to contribute to the solution of one of the most vexing problems America has faced.

APPENDIX A

CHRONOLOGICAL DISTRIBUTION OF RECONCILIATION SPEECHES IN THE NORTH

- 1868.--October 6 - Benjamin Hill, Young Men's Democratic Union Club,
New York.
- 1874.--June 6 - Benjamin Hill, Society of New York Editors, New York.
- 1875.--March 6 - Lucius Lamar, Marshfield Club, Boston.
_____.--March 9 - Lucius Lamar, Democratic Rally, Nashua, New Hampshire.
_____.--May 3 - Alfred Waddell, Union Volunteers Convention, New York.
_____.--June 16 - Thomas I. Simons, Boston Centennial, Columbus Square,
Boston; Garnett Andrews, Boston Music Hall; Fitzhugh Lee, Boston
Music Hall; James Gilchrist, Boston State House; James Porter,
Boston State House.
- 1877.--May 30 - Roger Pryor, Memorial Day Celebration, Brooklyn;
Henry Watterson, National Cemetery, Nashville.
_____.--June 20 - Wade Hampton, Testimonial Rally, Auburn, New York.
_____.--August 16 - David Key, Centennial of Battle of Bennington,
Bennington, Vermont.
_____.--September 13 - Wade Hampton, Winnebago County Fair, Rockford,
Illinois.
_____.--November 20 - Henry Watterson, Chicago Music Hall, Chicago.
- 1878.--April 27 - John B. Gordon, Commercial Club of Boston, Boston.
_____.--June 4 - Henry Watterson, Union Soldiers' Home, Dayton, Ohio.
- 1879.--May 21 - Alfred H. Colquitt, Brooklyn Sunday School Union,
Brooklyn.
- 1883.--February 7 - Fitzhugh Lee, Reception by New York National Guard,
New York.
_____.--February 9 - Fitzhugh Lee, Banquet by New York National Guard,
New York.
_____.--July 4 - M. B. Ball, Return of a Flag to New York Regiment,
New York; Charles Portlock, Return of a Flag, New York.
_____.--October 11 - Henry Watterson, American Bankers Association,
Louisville.
- 1884.--December 12 - John B. Gordon, Merchants and Business Men's Club,
New York.

- 1886.--December 23 - Henry Grady, New England Society of New York,
New York.
_____.--December 23 - W. L. Trenholm, New England Society of Philadelphia,
Philadelphia.
- 1887.--July 4 - Fitzhugh Lee, Fourth of July Address, New York.
_____.--September 17 - Fitzhugh Lee, Hibernian Society of Philadelphia,
Philadelphia.
_____.--October 28 - John B. Gordon, Political Rally, Cincinnati.
_____.--October 29 - John B. Gordon, Political Rally, Columbus.
_____.--November 1 - John B. Gordon, Political Rally, Cleveland.
- 1888.--July 3 - John B. Gordon, Gettysburg Reunion, Gettysburg.
- 1889.--December 13 - Henry Grady, Boston Merchants Association, Boston.
_____.--December 14 - Henry Grady, Bay State Club, Boston.
- 1890.--October 3 - Henry Watterson, Boston Merchants Association, Boston.
- 1891.--October 9 - Henry Watterson, Banquet of Army of the Tennessee,
Chicago.
- 1892.--May 30 - Charles Marshall, Grant's Tomb Ceremonies, New York.
_____.--October 21 - Henry Watterson, World's Fair Dedication, Chicago.
- 1893.--November 25 - John B. Gordon, Public Lecture, Chicago.
- 1894.--April 27 - Hillary Herbert, Grant's Birthday Dinner, New York.
_____.--September 11 - Henry Watterson, National G. A. R. Encampment,
Pittsburgh.
_____.--September 11 - Henry Watterson, G. A. R. Meeting, Allegheny,
Pennsylvania.
_____.--December 22 - Henry Watterson, New England Society of New York,
New York.
- 1895.--February 12 - Henry Watterson, Lincoln Lecture, Chicago.
_____.--February 15 - Hillary Herbert, Lincoln's Birthday Celebration,
Philadelphia.
_____.--February 16 - John B. Gordon, Public Lecture, Brooklyn.
_____.--May 14 - Henry Watterson, Lincoln Lecture, Brooklyn.
_____.--May 30 - Wade Hampton, Monument Dedication, Chicago.
_____.--September 11 - Henry Watterson, Welcome to G. A. R., Louisville.
_____.--September 11 - Simon Buckner, G. A. R. Encampment, Louisville.
_____.--September 12 - Bennett Young, Columbia G. A. R. Post, Louisville.
_____.--February 12 - John B. Gordon, Public Lecture, Chicago.
_____.--December 22 - John B. Gordon, Public Lecture, Chicago.
- 1898.--April 27 - Henry Watterson, Grant Monument Association, New York.
_____.--October 19 - Clark Howell, Peace Jubilee Banquet, Chicago.
- 1899.--May 30 - Joseph Wheeler, G. A. R. Public Dinner, Boston.
_____.--May 30 - Joseph Wheeler, Memorial Day Ceremonies, Boston.

- ____.--May 30 - Henry Watterson, Memorial Day Ceremonies, Louisville.
- ____.--December 21 - Thomas Nelson Page, New England Society of
Brooklyn, Brooklyn.
- ____.--December 22 - William Gordon McCabe, New England Society of
New York, New York.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles

- "Alabama and Connecticut," Harper's Weekly, XXXI (October 1, 1887), 703.
- "Alexander H. Stephens," Harper's Weekly, XXVII (March 10, 1883), 150.
- "Are We a Nation?" Harper's Weekly, XX (January 8, 1876), 22.
- "At Rest," Independent, XXXVII (August 13, 1885), 1044.
- Bell, Harry Hewett. "Henry Watterson," New York Times Magazine, XI (October 24, 1897), 2.
- "The Bloody Shirt," Harper's Weekly, XX (February 26, 1878), 162.
- "The Blue and the Gray," Harper's Weekly, XXI (June 9, 1877), 642.
- "The Blue and the Gray," Harper's Weekly, XXXI (September 10, 1887), 4.
- Brigance, William N. "The Twenty-Eight Foremost American Orators," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIV (October, 1938), 380.
- Brown, William G. "The North's Part in Southern Betterment," Outlook, LXXX (October 15, 1904), 415-18.
- Bruce, Phillip A. "Revolution in the Southern States," The Contemporary Review, LXXVIII (December, 1900), 58-73.
- "Bunker Hill," Harper's Weekly, XIX (July 3, 1875), 141.
- "Bunker Hill and Union," Harper's Weekly, XIX (July 31, 1875), 91.
- Cable, George W. "The Silent South," Century Magazine, XXX (September, 1885), 674.
- "Centennial Conciliation," Harper's Weekly, XX (February 12, 1876), 122.
- Colston, Ralph E. "Gettysburg Twenty-Five Years After," Century, XXXVI (September, 1888), 791f.
- "A Constant Reminder," Harper's Weekly (January 29, 1876), 49.
- "Cost of Dissention," Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper, XLV (February 2, 1878), 370.

Crawford, T. Rensen. "The Early Home of Henry W. Grady," New England Magazine, II (May, 1890), 425.

"The Cry of 'Reconciliation'," Harper's Weekly, XVI (October 19, 1872), 122.

"The Cure for the South," Nation, X (January 20, 1870), 36.

"Decoration Day," Harper's Weekly, XXXIV (May 31, 1890), 418.

"Decoration Day," Harper's Weekly, XXX (June 5, 1886), 354.

"Decoration Day," Harper's Weekly, XXVII (June 2, 1883), 338.

"Decoration Day," Harper's Weekly, XXXII (June 9, 1888), 407.

"Decoration Day," Harper's Weekly, XXXIII (June 1, 1889), 426.

"The Development of the South," Harper's Weekly, XXXVIII (September 29, 1894), 311.

"Exodus from the South," DeBow's Review, III, Series ii (May, 1876), 19.

Fitzhugh, George. "Impending Fate of the Country," DeBow's Review, II, Series ii (December, 1866), 91.

_____. "The Return of Good Feeling," DeBow's Review, IV, Series ii (December, 1867), 290.

"The Future Relations of North and South," Nation, II (January 18, 1866), 80.

"The Georgia Jubilee," Harper's Weekly, XIII (October 30, 1869), 691.

"The Gettysburg Reunion," Harper's Weekly, XXXII (July 14, 1888), 507.

"Governor Hampton at Auburn," Harper's Weekly, XXI (July 7, 1877), 519.

"The Grady Speech," Harper's Weekly, XXXI (January 8, 1887), 19.

"Henry Watterson," New York Times Magazine, XI (October 24, 1897), 4.

"Henry Woodfen Grady," Harper's Weekly, XXXIV (January 4, 1890), 15f.

"Henry W. Grady," Harper's Weekly, XXXIV (January 4, 1890), 3.

"Immediate Reconstruction a Duty," Nation, IV (February 7, 1867), 111.

"Jefferson Davis," Harper's Weekly, XIX (May 22, 1875), 414.

"Jubilee of the New South," Century, LI (February, 1896), 59.

Kilmer, George A. "A Note of Peace," Century, XLIII (June, 1888), 440ff.

- Long, W. G. "Public Address as a Force in History," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVII (February, 1852), 34.
- "The Late Fourth," Harper's Weekly, XXVI (July 15, 1882), 434.
- Lee, J. W. "Henry W. Grady," Arena, II (June, 1890), 101.
- "Let Us Have Peace," Century, XXIX (February, 1885), 638.
- "Louisville and Chickamauga," Harper's Weekly, XXXVIII (September 21, 1895), 889.
- Miles, Dudley H. "The Healing of a National Breach," Independent, LXXI (June, 1911), 1262-64.
- "Mr. Chamberlain's Confessions," Nation, XXIV (May 24, 1877), 302.
- "Mr. Sherman at Nashville," Harper's Weekly, XXXI (April 9, 1887), 250.
- "Mr. Watterson's Speech," Harper's Weekly, XXXIV (October 11, 1890), 787.
- "The Monument to Henry W. Grady," Harper's Weekly, XXXV (October 24, 1891), 830.
- "The National Idea," Harper's Weekly, XIX (June 26, 1875), 514.
- "The New North," Century, XXXIII (March, 1887), 51.
- "The New South," Harper's Weekly, XXXI (January 1, 1887), 3.
- "The Nomination of Mr. Lamar," Harper's Weekly, XXXII, (January 7, 1888), 2.
- "North and South," Century Magazine, XXX (October, 1885), 151.
- "North and South," Harper's Weekly, XIX (May 22, 1875), 414.
- "The North and the South," Harper's Weekly, XX (January 29, 1876), 82.
- "The North and the South," Harper's Weekly, XXI (March 17, 1877), 92.
- "The Obsequies of General Grant," Independent, XXXVII (August 13, 1885), 1044.
- "The Old Union and the New," Harper's Weekly, XXXVI (April 9, 1892), 339.
- "Our Maps of the Southern States," Harper's Weekly, X (January 6, 1866), 3.
- Palmer, Alice Freeman. "Some Lasting Results of the World's Fair," Forum, XVI (January, 1894), 21.
- "Patriotism," Harper's Weekly, XXXII (May 19, 1888), 350.
- Payne, E. N. "Changes in the South," Independent, LVII (April 25, 1895), 109.

- "Peace," Harper's Weekly, XXXI (January 16, 1887), 498.
- "Peace," Harper's Weekly, XXXI (July 16, 1887), 28.
- "The Prosperous South," Nation, LII (May 7, 1891), 375.
- "Reconstruction," Atlantic Monthly, XVIII (December, 1866), 763.
- "Reconciliation," Harper's Weekly, XVI (October 12, 1872), 787.
- "Reconstruction Discussion," Nation, II (May 22, 1866), 648f.
- Reed, John C. "Reminiscences of Ben Hill," South Atlantic Quarterly, V (April, 1906), 129.
- "The Restoration of a Flag," Harper's Weekly, XXVII (July 14, 1883), 435.
- "Sectional Jealousy," Harper's Weekly, XXI (January 26, 1878), 66.
- "Senator John B. Gordon," Harper's Weekly, XXIV (November 29, 1890), 935.
- "The Silver Lining of the Cloud," Harper's Weekly (July 2, 1887), 466.
- "Soldiers' Memorial Services," Century, XXXVIII (May, 1889), 157.
- "The South," Harper's Weekly, XVI (November 2, 1872), 843.
- "The South," Harper's Weekly, XXII (April 6, 1878), 266.
- "The South," Nation, XII (December 7, 1871), 364.
- "The South and the Centennial," Nation, XX (June 3, 1875), 372.
- "The Southern Negro," Outlook, LXXVII (August 13, 1904), 879-883.
- "The Story of a Flag," Harper's Weekly, XXXI (September 24, 1887), 683.
- "The Tammany Hall Convention," Harper's Weekly, XII (July 18, 1868), 458.
- Touree, A. W. "The South as a Field for Fiction," Forum, VI (December, 1888), 404.
- "Twenty Years After the War," Century, XXX (July, 1885), 458.
- "Uncle Sam's New Year," Harper's Weekly, XXXIV (January 4, 1890), 2.
- "Wade Hampton's Speech," Harper's Weekly, XXXI (July 16, 1887), 498.
- "Wade Hampton's Visit," Harper's Weekly, XXI (July 7, 1877), 519.
- Walker, Francis A. "America's Fourth Centenary," Forum, VIII (February, 1890), 88.

Warner, Charles Dudley. "The Industrial South," Harper's Weekly, XXXI (January 15, 1887), 42.

Watterson, Henry. "The Hysteria of Sectional Agitation," Forum, V (April, 1888), 158.

_____. "Oddities of Southern Life," Century, XXVII (March, 1883), 895.

Books

Andrews, Benjamin. The History of the Last Quarter-Century in the United States, 1870-1895. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.

Baird, A. Craig. Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950.

Beard, Charles and Mary. The Rise of American Civilization. New York: MacMillan, 1927-1942.

Blackstone, Harriet. The Best American Orations of To-Day. New York: Hinds and Noble, 1903.

Bowers, Claude G. The Tragic Era. Cambridge: The Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1929.

Brewer, David J. (ed.). World's Best Orations. 2 vols. St. Louis: The Kaiser Co., 1899.

Buck, Paul H. The Road to Reunion. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1937.

Cate, Wirt Armistead. Lucius Q. C. Lamar. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1935.

Cleveland, Henry. Alexander H. Stephens in Public and Private, with letters and speeches, before and during and since the War. Philadelphia: Philadelphia National Publishing Co., 1868.

Cooper, Lane. The Rhetoric of Aristotle. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1932.

Coulter, Ellis Merton. The Civil War and Readjustment in Kentucky. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1926.

_____. The South During Reconstruction, 1865-1877. University, Louisiana: The Littlefield Fund for Southern History of the University of Texas, 1947.

Depew, Chauncey. (ed.). Library of Oratory. 12 vols. New York: Dumont, 1902.

Dewey, Davis R. National Problems, 1885-1897. Vol. XXIV of The American Nation: A History. Edited by A. B. Hart. 28 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1904-1918.

- Dowd, Clement. Life of Zebulon B. Vance. Charlotte Observer Printing and Publishing House, 1897.
- Dunning, William A. Reconstruction, Political and Economic, 1865-1877. Vol. XXII of The American Nation: A History. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1907-1918.
- Dyer, John P. "Fightin' Joe" Wheeler. University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University, 1940.
- Gabriel, Ralph Henry. The Course of American Democratic Thought. New York: Ronald Press, 1940.
- Gaines, Francis P. Southern Oratory. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1946.
- Graves, John T., et. al. Eloquent Sons of the South. 2 vols. Boston: The Chapple Publishing Co., 1909.
- Harris, Joel Chandler. Henry W. Grady, His Life, Writings, and Speeches. New York: Cassell Publishing Co., 1890.
- Harris, M. A. Selected Orations. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1924.
- Haworth, Paul. The U. S. in Our Own Times. New York: Scribner's Sons 1924.
- Henry, R. S. The Story of Reconstruction. New York: Grossett and Dunlap, 1939.
- Hesseltine, William B. The South in American History. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949.
- Hicks, John D. The American Nation. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1945.
- Hill, Benjamin. Notes of the Situation. Augusta: Chronicle and Sentinel, 1867.
- Hill, Benjamin H., Jr. Senator Benjamin H. Hill: His Life, Speeches and Writings. Atlanta: T. H. P. Bloodworth, 1893.
- Hudson, William. Random Recollections of An Old Political Reporter. New York: Cripples, 1911.
- Johnson, Alexander. American Orations. 9 vols. New York: G. B. Putnam's Sons, 1902.
- _____ and Woodbury, James A. American Orations, 4 vols. Fourth Series. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1902.
- Johnson, Allen (ed.). Dictionary of American Biography. Vols. I, X. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.

- Jones, J. William (ed.). Southern Historical Society Papers.
Richmond: Southern Historical Society, 1883.
- Kendrick, Benjamin B. and Arnett, A. M. The South Looks at Its Past.
Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935.
- Lamar, Dolly Blunt. When All is Said and Done. Athens: University
of Georgia Press, 1952.
- LaPiere, Richard. Collective Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.
- Lee, James W. Henry W. Grady: The Editor, The Orator, The Man. St.
Louis: Christian Advocate Company, 1896.
- McClure, Alexander. Famous American Statesmen and Orators. 6 vols.
New York: F. F. Lovell, 1902.
- Malone, Dumas. Dictionary of American Biography, Vol. VIII. New
York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.
- Mayes, Edward. Lucius Q. C. Lamar: His Life, times, and speeches.
Nashville: Methodist Publishing House, 1896.
- National Cyclopedia of American Biography. Vol. I. New York: James
T. White, 1898.
- Nevins, Allan. American Press Opinion, Washington to Coolidge. Boston:
D. C. Heath, 1928.
- Nixon, Raymond B. Henry W. Grady, Spokesman of the New South. New
York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1943.
- Norton, Samuel, and Howe, M. A. Dewitt (eds.). Letters of Charles
Eliot Norton. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1913.
- O'Neil, James Milton. Models of Speech Composition. New York: D.
Appleton-Century Co., 1921.
- Pearce, Haywood J. Benjamin H. Hill, Secession and Reconstruction.
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1928.
- Pendleton, Louis. Alexander H. Stephens. Philadelphia: George W.
Jacobs and Co., 1908.
- Reed, Thomas B. Modern Eloquence. 12 vols. Philadelphia: John D.
Morris and Co., 1900.
- Richardson, E. Ramsay. Little Aleck. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co.,
1932.
- Rowland, Dunbar (ed.). Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist. Jackson:
Mississippi Department of Archives and History, 1923.

- Sarett, Lou, and Foster, William T. Basic Principles of Speech.
Cambridge: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1946.
- Seligman, Edwin (ed.). Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. Vol.
XIII. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948.
- Shaw, Warren C. History of American Oratory. Indianapolis: Bobbs-
Merrill Co., 1928.
- Shurter, Edwin D. Complete Orations and Speeches of H. W. Grady.
Austin: Southwest Publishing Co., 1910.
- _____. Oratory of the South. New York: The Neale Publishing Co.,
1908.
- Sutton, Roberta B. Speech Index. New York: Wilson, 1935.
- Thompson, C. M. The Fiery Epoch, 1830-1877. New York: Bobbs-Merrill,
1931.
- Thorndike, Ashley (ed.). Modern Eloquence. 15 vols. New York: The
Collier Co., 1941.
- Turpin, Edna Henry Lee. (ed.). The New South and Other Addresses.
New York: Maynard, Merrill and Co., 1904.
- United Confederate Veterans Committee. Proceedings of the Convention
for the Organization of the United Confederate Veterans. Minutes
of the United Confederate Veterans. Vol. I. Richmond: J. A.
Partridge, 1889.
- Waddell, Alfred Moore. The Confederate Soldier. Address at Steinway
Hall, New York, May 3, 1878. Washington: J. L. Pearson, 1878.
- Warmoth, H. C. War, Politics, and Reconstruction. New York: Macmillan
Co., 1930.
- Watson, Thomas. The South in the Building of the Nation. Vol. IX.
Richmond: The Southern Historical Publication Society, 1889.
- Watterson, Henry. Abraham Lincoln. An oration delivered before the
Lincoln Union by Henry Watterson, Auditorium, Chicago, Feb. 12,
1895. Louisville: Courier-Journal Co., 1899.
- _____. Compromises of Life. New York: Duffield and Co., 1906.
- _____. Marse Henry. 2 vols. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1919.
- Wellman, Manly W. Giant in Gray. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1949.
- Woodward, Comer Vann. Origins of the New South. University,
Louisiana: The Littlefield Fund for Southern History of the
University of Texas, 1951.

- _____. Reunion and Reaction. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1951.
- Young, Bennett Henderson (ed.). Kentucky Eloquence, Past and Present. Louisville: B. LaBree, Jr., 1907.

Newspapers

- Atlanta Herald, March 14, 1874.
- Boston Advertiser, March 7, 1875.
- Boston Daily Globe, December 13, 1889-July 16, 1893.
- Boston Evening Transcript, April 29, 1878.
- Boston Pilot, September 13, 1899-December 23, 1899.
- Chicago Tribune, September 1, 1877-October 20, 1898.
- Cincinnati Enquirer, October 26-November 12, 1887.
- Cleveland Leader, September 28-November 9, 1887.
- Dayton Daily Journal, June 4-6, 1878; October 28-November 9, 1887.
- Duluth Minnesotan, October 10-December 12,, 1875.
- Louisville Courier-Journal, September 10, 1887-July 12, 1889; September 9-13, 1895.
- New York Herald, June 1, 1877-September 18, 1887.
- New York Sun, December 23, 1899.
- New York Times, January 1, 1866-January 1, 1900.
- Pittsburgh Commercial Gazette, July 1-August 31, 1888; September 10-13, 1894.
- St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 22, 1875-December 24, 1899.
- Springfield Republican, May 1--August 13, 1879.

Public Documents

- Shanks, Howard. "Report on Treatment of Prisoners by the Confederates," House Reports, No. 45, Vol. IV. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. Eleventh Census of the United States:

1890. Report on Manufacturing Industries, Vol. II. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1895.

_____. Eleventh Census of the United States: 1890. Report on Wealth, Debt and Taxes, Vol. II. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1895.

_____. Ninth Census of the United States: 1870. Population, Vol. I. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1872.

_____, Tenth Census of the United States: 1880. Compendium, Part II. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1883.

U. S. Centennial Commission. Reports, International Exhibition, 1876, Vol. II. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880.

U. S. Joint Committee on Reconstruction. "Report Adverse to Allowing Confederate States a Representation in the Congress of the United States," House of Representatives Report No. 30, Vol. II. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1877.

Unpublished Material

Ackeley, John. "Elements of Persuasion in the Oratory of Henry W. Grady." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Speech, University of Southern California, 1933.

Bauer, Marvin G. "Henry Grady, Spokesman of the New South." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Department of Speech, University of Wisconsin, 1936.

Bryan, E. C. "Henry W. Grady as an Occasional Orator." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Speech, University of Iowa, 1931.

Hadley, Dorothy S. "Contemporary Estimate of Henry W. Grady as a Public Speaker." Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Speech, Northwestern University, 1937.

Keeney, Ethel. "Sources of Persuasive Power in Speeches of Henry Grady." Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Speech, Northwestern University, 1930.

New England Society. "Eighty-First Anniversary Celebration of the New England Society in the City of New York, at Delmonico's, December 22, 1886." Bound in "Dawson Pamphlets," XLIII, nos. 15-29. Unpublished collection at University of North Carolina Library.

Streeter, Don. "A Rhetorical Criticism of the Major Public Addresses of Lucius Q. C. Lamar During the Period 1874 to 1901." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Department of Speech, University of Iowa, 1948.